



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

1649th

MEETING: 24 JUNE 1972

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

MAY 3 1976

UN/SA COLLECTION



CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1649)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715);	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 24 June 1972, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Guinea, India, Italy, Japan, Panama, Somalia, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1649)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715).

3. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716).

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10715)

The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 23 June 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10716)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1648th meeting, and if there is no objection, I propose to invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the matter inscribed on the Council's agenda.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I have just received letters, dated today, from the representatives of the Syrian Arab Repub-

lic, Egypt, Kuwait and Jordan, asking to be allowed to participate in discussion of the question before the Council, under the terms of Article 31 of the Charter.

3. If there is no objection, I shall, therefore, in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure and the usual practice of the Council, invite the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic, Egypt, Kuwait and Jordan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will take places at the Council table when they wish to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. G. J. Tomeh (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. A. Y. Bishara (Kuwait), and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took the places reserved for them.

4. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now continue its discussion on the matter inscribed on its agenda. The first name on the list of speakers this afternoon is that of the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the post of President of the Security Council for this month.

6. I had a great deal of hesitation about asking to address the Council today. I wanted to allow the Council to devote its full attention to the complaint of Lebanon against the acts of aggression committed by Israel—a complaint which was set forth so clearly and so convincingly yesterday [1648th meeting] by the representative of Lebanon. The representative of Israel, however, in his statement yesterday, launched into a diatribe against all the Arab countries, particularly Egypt and Lebanon. I have therefore asked to make a statement in order to make things quite clear. At the same time, I hope that the complaint of Lebanon will be the main subject of the discussion and that no diversion on the part of Israel will be detrimental to the purposeful deliberation of the Council.

7. The Government of Israel is showing its true face here. It can no longer deceive anyone. It feels itself so strong as to be arrogant, so powerful as to be despotic. It conducts itself in the occupied Arab territories as a colonizer, while colonialism has practically disappeared from the surface of the earth—with, of course, the exception of South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies. The Israelis conduct themselves on the occupied Arab territories as owners.

They change names that have existed for thousands of years and create situations which they deem to be irreversible. They conduct themselves as though they were the absolute masters of the occupied Arab territories and destroy entire villages, expel populations *en masse* and commit infamous crimes against innocent people. They have gone so far that Israel has been condemned not only by various United Nations organs—quite recently by the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 3 (XXVIII) of 22 March 1972¹—but, even more, in a whole series of articles published by the international press, which can certainly not be described as pro-Arab. I am referring to an article by David Hirst published on 29 April 1972 in the *Guardian* and *Le Monde*, an article entitled “The Battle of the Bulldozers”. And I am not overlooking the well-known article published in *The Times* of London on 28 October 1969, by the Foreign News Editor, E. C. Hodgkin. The list is a long one, but these two articles amply suffice to reveal the true face of Israel.

8. That is the background of the problem which we are discussing today. That problem is: first of all, three Arab countries which have been occupied; secondly, structural changes carried out in the occupied Arab territories; thirdly, a Palestinian population under the yoke of Israeli occupation; fourthly, Israeli forces powerfully armed by the United States of America.

9. Starting from those basic facts, we can, following strict Cartesian logic, arrive at the following deductions: first, a state of continuous tension despite the apparent calm—the Middle East is a powder keg on a sea of oil; secondly, violence on the part of the aggressor which can only breed more violence; thirdly, legitimate resistance to the occupation forces, resistance which will continue to increase.

10. As regards the state of tension, it will disappear only when the causes disappear. This is a clear case of cause and effect. Israel believes that it can have tranquillity because of its military power, and its leaders endeavour to convince the Israeli citizens of the justness of this policy. Thus, we recently read a statement made by the representative of Israel to the United Press news agency, after the Viet-Nam events, in which he said that the Middle East region was the calmest in the world. That is certainly an illusion, and the misfortune is that he really believes it. I will reply to the representative of Israel that calmness will not return to the region unless the following conditions are fulfilled: first, the implementation of United Nations resolutions, the resumption of the Jarring mission, the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied since 5 June 1967; secondly, the safeguarding of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Then and only then can a just and lasting peace be obtained in the region of the Middle East.

11. The position of Egypt is well known in that respect; I do not need to repeat it. Our just cause was solemnly and unanimously supported at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Rabat from 12 to 15 June 1972. The significant fact of the resolution adopted at Rabat is that the Heads of

African States, after having been directly implicated in the conflict, saw the entire truth explode before their eyes: they saw the conciliatory attitude of Egypt, its desire for peace and justice, and, on the other hand, the intransigence of Israel and the policy of annexing the territories of others. That noble and just attitude of the Heads of African States confirms and coincides with the attitude of all friendly and brotherly countries of the world which are peace-loving and are in favour of justice.

12. The Israeli leaders and all their friends who blindly support them maintain and believe—and here they commit a grave error—that the desire for peace shown by Egypt results from a position of weakness. The will to free occupied territories is the sacred and patriotic duty of all peoples, whose national soil is desecrated by foreign occupation. Israel, fearing our national right to liberate our territories, believes that it can intimidate us by a campaign of hatred against the Arabs, confusing the facts of the problem, and by invoking the myth of the destruction of Israel and of the Jewish people.

13. After the events of 1967, world opinion refuses to believe the deceits of Israel, and this explains why today there is a growing understanding on the part of world public opinion towards the Arab cause. We are aware of the appeal and the well-orchestrated propaganda of Zionism, but this is rejected not only by world public opinion but also by a large number of Jews themselves, enlightened, reasonable Jews, who take their religion seriously and who have contributed, as have many Moslems and Christians, to world civilization. Those wise Jews know that one cannot on the one hand follow the laws of Moses, with all their spiritual and moral values, including the law which forbids murder and coveting the goods of others, and at the same time justify the crimes of the Zionists against the Arabs.

14. Violence is the method used by Israel since its creation, and the letter of 23 June 1972 [S/10716] from the representative of Israel to the Security Council speaks of acts of terrorism. However, he has forgotten or omitted to mention that violence was introduced into the Middle East by such infamous terrorist Zionist organizations as the Haganah, the Stern Gang and the Irgun Zvai Leumi. Crocodile tears are shed regarding the death of innocent victims, while the history of the Middle East recalls a wealth of perfectly innocent persons who fell victim to Israeli terrorism and the barbaric Israeli practices. Suffice it to recall the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte. Count Bernadotte was assassinated by Israeli terrorists, among whom were most of the present Israeli leaders. They spoke about a massacre. Yet the massacres of Deir Yassin, Qibya, Nakalin, Samou, Gaza and many others are still present in the minds of all Arabs, men and women, young and old alike. Given their criminal past, how can the Zionist leaders of Israel expect the world to take them seriously when they pretend to be indignant or when they create an artificial atmosphere of sadness, with the sole intention of exploiting such a climate? Such hypocrisy and ill-faith will lead them absolutely nowhere; it will only plunge the Middle East region into a new era of accumulated sufferings, and the world into an era of tragedies and troubles.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 7, chap. XIII.*

15. On 2 June 1972 an Israeli Cabinet Minister, Israeli Galili, promised complete revenge for the events which took place at the Lod Airport. Similar statements have been made by other Israeli leaders, among them the Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir. Those terrorist statements were accompanied by open threat against other States, including Egypt. What is more, on 5 June the Israeli parliament, the Knesset, adopted a resolution containing threats of reprisals against certain Arab States. That resolution stated that Israel would take measures against those States in the exercise of its right to legitimate self-defence. Those threats, however, were intended to mask, for domestic purposes, the total defeat of the concepts on which the Israeli policy is based; it also reveals the firm intention of Israel to commit new acts of aggression against the Arab States in the region, in violation of the United Nations Charter. Only a week ago, the Israeli Air Force violated Egyptian air space north of the delta, and there was a fight between our air force and the Israeli air force.

16. Experience has shown that such reprisals are carried out to the detriment of women and children, as at Bahr El Bakar in Egypt, the school where 32 students were killed; of workers and innocent civilians, as in Abu Zaabal, in Egypt; or, again, of international civil aviation, as in the case of the attack on Beirut airport, in Lebanon. That is how the Israelis act and react. Yet they have had the audacity to speak about bloodshed and massacres. It is an irony of fate to hear terrorists speak of security and to see murderers cling to life. They forget or ignore what they have done and they think that the record has been lost or that certain rights have been acquired. What they have done and continue to do in Gaza, in Sinai, on the Golan heights, on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the town of Suez bears witness to the cruelty and terrorism of Israel. Let the world see the cities once known for their prosperity and the happiness of their inhabitants which are now but pitiful ruins, after the devastation wrought by Zionist madness has left its mark throughout those territories. Responsibility for the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East cannot be attributed to anyone but Israel and its arrogant, irresponsible policies, and we categorically reject all the false accusations of the Israeli leaders against Egypt.

17. But when seeking the motives, we cannot fail to consider what has prompted Israel to launch now its hysterical campaign against Lebanon and Egypt, to come back to the myth of the destruction of Israel and the Jewish people, and to carry out this punitive military expedition against Lebanon to influence the electoral campaign in the United States and try to obtain even more support from the United States of America. The Government of Egypt wishes to state solemnly that full responsibility for the present situation in the Middle East and for the grave consequences which might result therefrom rests with Israel and with the United States of America, which supports Israel by every means.

18. We welcome and greet our courageous brothers in Lebanon and in Palestine for their brave resistance to the Zionist aggression, and we firmly support the complaint of Lebanon. It is time for the Security Council, before it is too late, to take the appropriate measures by condemning Israel for its premeditated aggression against Lebanon and by

calling upon Israel to liberate the Syrian and Lebanese officers who were unlawfully removed from Lebanese territory.

19. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on the list is the representative of Kuwait, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

20. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you on behalf of my delegation for acceding to my request to be allowed to address the Security Council on the present item. Your long experience and ability have contributed to the success demonstrated recently in the consultations conducted under your presidency.

21. The Council has been seized of the problem of Palestine since its inception. Resolutions, over 200 in number, have been adopted in the United Nations organs, the principal one of which is the Security Council. In every case the Council has been prescribing palliatives for a situation that requires a fundamental solution, a solution that reaches the deep-seated facets of the problem, a solution that takes into its perspective the tribulations aggravated through more than two decades of nefarious eviction, displacement and persecution. Even the proverbial resolution 242 (1967) never escapes the ambiguities that have heretofore furnished the unwilling with the means for contorted interpretations. The adoption of a resolution containing a "deploring" or even a "condemning" clause is no consolation to the continuously multiplying victims of Zionist aggression. What is required now is to combine words with action to enforce the United Nations resolutions adopted since 1947 on the unwilling and the arrogant.

22. Since the Lod airport incident the barrage of Israeli threats against Arab countries has continued unabated. In the first week of June, Arab ambassadors in the United Nations drew the attention of the President of the Security Council and the Under-Secretary-General to the serious nature of the Israeli threats. Judging the record of criminality of Israel, they expressed their concern and apprehension. On 21 June Israel unleashed its venomous campaign of terror and destruction against Lebanon. Before the dust of the Lod event settled, Ministers in the Israeli Cabinet had set in motion the series of threats, soaked in an insatiable lust for destruction, slaughter and carnage, under the tissue-thin pretext of self-defence. In the opinion of the Israeli Government, Lebanon had to pay for an act carried out by three Japanese who arrived at the Lod airport from Europe and who had never set foot on Lebanese soil. While no one condones the killing of innocent people, neither should anyone tolerate Israel's flimsy excuse for remorselessly inflicting terror and savage brutality in its chain of aggressions.

23. The Lebanese authorities have incessantly denied any responsibility for the Lod event. The President of the Lebanese Republic publicly deplored the loss of innocent lives. Despite this denial, Israel has determinedly waged the present onslaught on Lebanese villages, which has resulted in scores of victims, demolished homes and displaced persons. Is it really self-defence that motivates Israel to take action against Lebanon? One doubts the veracity of that

argument. In our view, the airport episode is only an ostensible password to the crux of the truth, which is indubitably the invasion of Lebanon and the occupation of its southern tip, in deference to the Zionist postulate that the southern part of Lebanon should be included in the Zionist State in order to consummate the theory of the perfectly defensible borders. Palestine was occupied by well-hatched armed plots through the process of gradualism, followed by Sinai and the Syrian Golan heights in 1967, and now it is Lebanon's turn. The flimsy Israeli argument that Lebanon has been harbouring guerrillas has become too hackneyed to fool anyone. It is not the guerrillas' incursions, nor is it the aftermath of the Lod airport event, that has spurred Israel to attack Lebanon; it is, in all certitude, the expansionistic nature of the Zionist movement, which has never relinquished hope for a large portion of Lebanon's southern territory. It is simply the craving for the usurpation of Lebanese soil, impeccably cloaked in pathetic concern for the protection of lives.

24. Israel resorts too often to the erroneous premise that the Arab Governments have been abetting and assisting the Palestinian guerrillas in causing damage inside Israel's territory. The Israeli Government, in maintaining this view, not only distorts the reality of the situation but tears the fabric of fact. The Palestinians, as the facts glaringly proclaim, were subjected in 1948 to a perfidious aggression that brought displacement, eviction and misery to them. Since then, these Palestinians have been living in slums, subsisting on the alms and charity of largesse. The piles of United Nations resolutions tantalize them in their hope for repatriation to their homes and lands. None of these resolutions, which recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinians in their homeland, has been implemented. Disillusioned by the complacency and disinterestedness of the world, they have realized that their aspirations cannot be achieved while they rot in dire conditions in the camps. What they ask for is the restoration of their own legitimate rights. What Israel calls "terrorism" is in fact the indignation of a people denied its own rights and which has demonstrated the will not to perish in the abysmal misery of sordid camps. This continued denial of their rights is the crux of the whole issue; the other matters are merely ramifications.

25. Last night the Ambassador of Israel uttered his yearnings for peace [1648th meeting]. We share his yearnings for peace; but peace for him is the dictate of the victor over the vanquished and frustrated, the acceptance of the fait accompli and compliance with the expansionist policy of Israel. For us it is peace based on justice in accordance with United Nations resolutions and in compliance with the dictates and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

26. For Israel, Jerusalem is not negotiable; neither are the Syrian Golan heights, Sharm El-Sheikh, Gaza and many other portions of Arab territories. For Israel the withdrawal to the pre-June borders and a just solution for the Palestinians in accordance with United Nations resolutions are inconceivable.

27. In an interview which Mrs. Meir gave to Mr. Sulzberger of *The New York Times* and which was quoted in the

International Herald Tribune of 31 January 1972, the following exchange took place:

"Question: What territory do you consider necessary for Israel's security?

"Answer: If you mean that we should draw a line, that we haven't done. We will do that when we get to it. But one basic article in Israel's policy is that the borders of 4 June 1967 cannot be re-established in the peace agreement. There must be changes in the borders, we want changes in borders, in all our borders, for security's sake."

28. General Dayan's revealing remark that he would prefer Sharm El-Sheikh without peace to peace without Sharm El-Sheikh demonstrates the expansionist mentality of the ruling circles in Israel. Mr. Horowitz, a leading Israeli, wrote in *The Times* of London on 6 June 1972: "Peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved at the expense of security"—that is, security should come first, before peace.

29. This attempt by Israel to achieve its own security without regard to the security and other interests of the Arabs is bound to fail and sooner or later, in our view, to provoke renewed conflict. Mr. Kissinger, a famous White House man, as representatives know, has pointed out: "the desire of one Power for absolute security means absolute insecurity for all the others."

30. Let me echo what a great American said in February 1957. President Eisenhower said in circumstances similar to the present ones:

"Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal? If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order."

31. The inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war is one of the most sacrosanct principles of the United Nations and international law. If that principle is flouted chaos will supersede order.

32. The Reverend A. M. Crowe wrote in *The Times* of London in June 1972:

"Israel has been insensitive to world opinion by her policy over Jerusalem and by 'creating facts' on occupied territory. The Palestinians have been driven to acts of violence because they feel that the world has neglected their cause. Palestinian hijackings are a desperate attempt to tell the world that their country, too, has been hijacked with the connivance of the Western Powers."

33. In an interview with *The Observer* of 7 May 1972, Mr. Eban, the Foreign Minister of Israel, said: "We have clarified our willingness to withdraw to new boundaries—whose changes will be dictated only by security needs". "Security needs" in the Israeli dictionary of politics is a euphemism for expansion and usurpation. *The Observer* stated that Mr. Eban "admits that Israel would start the

negotiations by demanding that Gaza should not be separated from Israel".

34. We are adamant in our belief that the tranquillity of the area and the achievement of a long-sought-after peace are contingent on withdrawal from all Arab territories and implementation of the United Nations resolutions pertaining to the rights of the Palestinians in their homeland. The *sine qua non* of peace is the recognition by Israel of that fact. United Nations principles should be sanctified and not flouted and Israel's record in flouting these principles is beyond description. It is now time for the Security Council to examine the situation not in the light of the present aggression against Lebanon but in the light of the havoc Israel has created in the region since its usurpation of Arab land and, accordingly, to apply the necessary measures to secure the implementation of the relevant resolution which is so long overdue. A famous American philosopher, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, said: "No question is ever settled until it is settled right". That laconic advice should be heeded. Therein resides our hope.

35. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Jordan, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

36. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): Mr. President, allow me to express to you my delegation's respect and confidence in your leadership of this august body.

37. I would not have imposed myself upon the deliberations of the Council at this urgent and decisive stage if my country had not been arbitrarily and deliberately drawn into the debate by the Israeli representative through his distortion of facts and false accusations. These diversionary tactics by the Israeli representative are both familiar and repulsive to the Council. When indictment against Israel in a specific crime is as clear as the one before the Council now, the Israeli delegation has always attempted to undermine the clarity of the theme by offensive digressions and provocations. Well, I shall briefly set the record straight regarding the areas in which the Israeli representative invoked my country's name. I should like to do that only in the context of the issue before the Council.

38. The issue before the Council today is defined and simple. It is also of such a representative character that swift and decisive action should be taken regarding it. Again Lebanon, a moderate and peaceful country, comes to the Security Council protesting savage and destructive raids by air and on the ground by Israeli armed forces. Again the targets have been the civilian population, their homes and farms and children. Scores of civilians were killed or wounded in the attacks; scores of officers and military people were killed and wounded. The casualties could have been greater, and there could be more in the future if the Security Council and the international community behind it does not act to restrain the aggressor.

39. It must be particularly shocking to any international observer, over and above the fact of the savage attack, that Israel send its tanks and armoured vehicles to ambush and abduct, well inside Lebanese territory, un-

armed Syrian officers in a routine visit to their Lebanese colleagues together with their Lebanese escorting officers. Such an action requires no heroism. It can be carried out by any armed group against another group when there are common borders or physical proximity. The issue before the Council is to decide on compelling Israel to abide by international norms and to refrain from its policy of systematic violence against Lebanon and its other Arab neighbours. The issue is also to punish Israel for its recent aggression against Lebanon. The Council must further act on the immediate release of the kidnapped officers. No other issue is before the Council at this meeting. It is not dealing with international aviation or unlawful interference therewith. Its position has been made clear on that question. Nor is the issue the Middle East question at large. On that question the position of the Security Council is very well known. It was made known in November 1967 [resolution 242 (1967)], and since then Israel has been engaging in killing that resolution. It was made known repeatedly on Jerusalem, when all Israeli measures to deform and depopulate and swallow Arab Jerusalem were condemned and declared invalid.

40. The United Nations position was made known in the General Assembly throughout its debates and through resolutions adopted by its various organs since 1967. The Assembly repeatedly declared the Israeli annexation of the occupied territories inadmissible. It called for Israeli withdrawal and characterized the occupation as a negation of the human rights of the Arab population living thereunder. It judged Israeli conduct and practices in the occupied territories as war crimes. How far from the picture of tranquillity in the occupied territories—almost love and brotherhood between the occupying forces and the one million victims of occupation.

41. When the General Assembly adopts strong and repeated condemnations of Israeli occupation practices and the Human Rights Commission issues a categorical verdict of war criminality, the Israeli representative refers here to the occupied and downtrodden Arab territories as "administered territories". In the same breath of hypocrisy he refers to the union of the Arab people on the two banks of the River Jordan before the advent of the present occupation in 1967 as "occupation". The presence of the army of the united people of two wings of Jordan on its own national soil is described as occupation. When the people of East and West Jordan decided in 1949, through democratic and constitutional processes, to join in an equal and constitutional partnership they were only expressing an objective, human, cultural and geographic reality. They were achieving by the democratic expression of will the age-old hope of Arab unity and restoring a natural union disrupted only by the temporary presence of Western colonialism.

42. The people of Palestine on the West Bank of the Jordan were also uniting with their Arab brothers in the East to ensure the preservation of the Arab character of what remained of Palestine after the holocaust of 1948. The invasion of 1948, which the Israeli representative referred to and spoke of last night was, as he very well knows, the systematic and organized Zionist take-over of the substantial part of Palestine for the establishment of

Israel at the expense of the people who owned and lived in that part of the world.

43. That is the background of the union of the two Banks in 1949, when two wings of an ancient people met to forge a union of equality on the basis of full partnership in Parliament and in the Cabinet, in the armed forces and in national administration, in the economy and in efforts for social progress, in right and in duty, in prosperity and in adversity. When that happens, it is a national union and nothing else.

44. When the West Bank of the Jordan was attacked and occupied in 1967 it was a national disaster for the people of Jordan on both Banks as much as it was a national disaster for all Arabs. It was the mutilation of a people, the disruption of a common destiny. That is why we continue to believe that the occupation cannot last. The captivity of the Arabs of the West Bank, the Jordanians of the West Bank, the Palestinians of the West Bank cannot endure. Nor can the occupation of other Arab territories last; nor, of course, can occupation in any part of the world last.

45. And yet the important thing here is not the history of the union of the Arabs of the two Banks and how it came about. It is the fact of the present occupation. Let the occupation end, and the people of the occupied territories will decide for themselves what they want to choose for their future. While Jordan believes in the ultimate unity of the Arabs, it is committed to the principle of self-determination and its variety of courses and alternatives for our people in the occupied territories. Why cannot Israel conceive of that principle when it comes to the so-called administered territories? Why cannot Israel conceive of it when it comes to the Arab people of Jerusalem, when it comes to the one and a half million uprooted and dispossessed Palestinians seeking to return to their homes in the land on which Israel proper—not even the occupied territories—stands?

46. But the Security Council is not today dealing with the Middle East question at large, although it should do so at the appropriate time and under the proper conditions.

47. While the present Israeli violence against Lebanon is an expression of the Israeli violence which created the Arab-Israeli problem, it is only this present expression of violence against Lebanon that the Council must now judge and punish and control. Israel cannot justify its aggression by invoking self-defence or the activities of elements within or outside its area of occupation, for it has by deliberate and stubborn persistence closed itself to any rectification of the situation or any redressing of the enormous human injustice which was brought about by Israel's creation and perpetuated by Israel's conduct. When Israel blocks every avenue of constructive solution, both human and political, it has only itself to blame for the extremism it breeds, for the gulf it widens in its human environment and in the world.

48. But we must focus now on the Lebanese question alone. The Council recalls that since December 1968, when Israel attacked the Beirut international airport, the Council has rejected the Israeli logic of aggression in the name of retaliation. The Council condemned Israel unanimously

[resolution 262 (1968)] then and warned it against a repetition of the act. In August 1969, the Council again condemned Israel [resolution 270 (1969)] for its air attack on Lebanese villages in the south. It also declared that it would consider "further and more effective steps . . . to ensure against repetition". In May 1970, the Council condemned Israel [resolution 280 (1970)] again for the same crime. And only last February the Council met again to condemn Israel and warn it against future misconduct [resolution 313 (1972)].

49. The misconduct has been repeated. Israel has engaged again in violence and lawlessness against Lebanon. Now is the time to ensure that the aggressor is punished and the present victims guaranteed against future repetition of the crime. Israel must be brought under the law of nations and be made to comply with the international will. The case is in the hands of this important Council.

50. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Israel, on whom I now call.

51. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I have listened with care to the representative of Jordan and I shall make only one observation on his statement. If for reasons of his own he finds it necessary to disavow some of the positive comments I made yesterday about the fact that tranquillity prevails along the Israel-Jordan cease-fire line and react to those comments with a diatribe against my country, it is undoubtedly his right to do so. But I doubt whether this is a contribution to the improvement of the situation in the Middle East or to the present debate.

52. It is not surprising that the representative of Kuwait should have asked to speak. It is odd, however, that he found it possible to invoke United Nations resolutions on the Middle East situation. The Government of Kuwait has given open support and encouragement to terrorist organizations engaged in murderous operations against Israel and the people of Israel. Especially significant is the active assistance accorded to fund-raising and other financial matters. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait, Ahmad al-Jaber al-Sabah, recently announced that his Government's policy was to persist in efforts to help the terror organizations and to arrange for the raising of funds and the distribution of such funds among them. He has more than once stressed that Kuwait completely rejects Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 mentioned by the representative of Kuwait. A particularly serious view must be taken of this, because on 8 June 1967, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait officially informed the Secretary-General, in reply to his communication concerning the cease-fire resolutions then adopted by the Security Council, that the "Government of Kuwait will not observe nor adhere to these resolutions" [S/7948]. Subsequently, as I have already pointed out, the Government of Kuwait repeatedly repudiated Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

53. I should like to make a few observations regarding the statement of the representative of Egypt. I would suggest that developments in the Middle East should be put in proper focus. It was Egypt which in 1948 declared war on

Israel in defiance of the United Nations. And it was Egypt and its Secretary-General of the Arab League which informed the United Nations on behalf of all the Arab States that this war would be a massacre of the Jewish people reminiscent of Mongolian massacres. Israel stood firm against that invasion and forced the aggressor States to recoil. In 1948, in 1956 and in 1967 a truce, an armistice, and a cease-fire were successively established, but the war unleashed by Egypt in 1948 has not been terminated and still continues today. Throughout these years there has also been no change in the avowed objective of Egypt and of the other Arab States to destroy Israel, to destroy the people of Israel. That has been reflected, *inter alia*, in the method of terror warfare which is being discussed today in the Security Council, a method resorted to by Egypt and other Arab States during the periods when hostilities between the regular armed forces of the parties were at a standstill.

54. It was Egypt which, with the active support of some other Arab States, first launched such warfare in the early 1950s. The terror campaign was carried out by specially organized murder squads named "*fedayeen*", operating as a paramilitary force, equipped, trained and controlled by the Egyptian army. Their goal was defined as follows in an official communiqué issued by the Egyptian Government on 31 August 1955:

"Egypt has decided to dispatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh and the sons of Islam, and they will cleanse the land of Palestine. There will be no peace on Israel's border because we demand vengeance and vengeance is Israel's death."

55. The Egyptian attackers sowed death and destruction by throwing grenades into classrooms, by ambushing buses on highways, by demolishing houses with their inhabitants asleep. Radio Cairo boasted on 11 April 1956: "Cringe in fear, O Israel, for your future, night and day, and watch out for death at any time. The *fedayeen* are with you everywhere. Repent in the land which will be your grave."

56. The United Arab Republic, which today is Egypt, remained faithful to its campaign of organized terror against Israel after 1967 as well. In a speech to the National Assembly on 20 January 1969 President Nasser said:

"These organizations play a positive role in weakening and draining part of the enemy's strength and blood. Brothers, I wish to express with joy my gratitude and admiration for the four great organizations: Al Fatah, the Popular Front, the Liberation Organization and the Arab Sinai Organization."

57. A few weeks after the foregoing statement, the semi-official *Al Ahram* daily announced that Egypt will grant George Habash's Popular Front £2 million annually. On 22 February 1969 the former Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad said of these organizations: "We support them and provide them with all types of moral and material aid". And Abdul Majid Farid, Cairo Arab Socialist Union Secretary, declared on 2 March of that year: "Egypt supplied 70 per cent of all military and financial aid to *fedayeen*, as well as training. Israel well realized that rockets fired at Beit Shean and other Israeli settlements were Egyptian-produced".

58. This policy has been reaffirmed also in recent months. Vice-President Shafei of Egypt said on 5 March 1972:

"Terror operations in Sinai will supplement terror operations in other areas. If escalation of these operations should lead Israel to resort to counter-actions, we must be prepared for them and inflict losses on the enemy in any such attempt."

59. On 6 March, the *Washington Post* reported from Cairo the following:

"President Anwar Sadat will visit King Faisal of Saudi Arabia and Kuwaiti Ruler Sabat Salem el-Sabah this week to seek support for the Palestinian guerrillas who are operating against Israel. He will emphasize that the Arab States, while committed to a policy of war against Israel, must find ways of increase commando strikes until war comes."

This is what confronts Israel.

60. The semi-official *Al Ahram* of Cairo stated on 6 March of this year:

"Recognition of the Commandos' right to live and move freely along the strategically important border areas of the Arab States surrounding Israel was the most important element in the Arab-Israeli confrontation."

61. Now it is clear who is behind the terror operations. It is clear who has organized the terror organizations. It is clear who is backing the murderous attacks against the population of Israel. At the opening meeting of the convention of the Palestine terror organizations held in Cairo on 6 April 1972, President Sadat himself declared: "The only legitimate representation of the Palestinian people which it recognizes is yourselves"—that is the terror organizations responsible for the Lod massacre, the terror organizations responsible for ambushes of school buses on Israeli highways, the terror organizations responsible for the rockets which are being fired at Israeli villages and towns.

62. If this was not clear enough, if this was not precise enough, Vice-President Shafei again, on 8 March 1972, said the following:

"We must exhaust Israel's presence not only in the military field but in all fields. The money, the effort, the nervous energy that we invested in military force are the armour behind which we can act, according to a complete plan, to exhaust Israel's presence in all fields, by means of terror or political, cultural, ideological and scientific action."

63. Now this is the true face of Egypt, and this is the truth about Egypt's policy and actions. Israel cannot simply ignore these facts when it determines its position towards Egypt. Yet Israel continues to await some indication that the views and designs as enunciated by President Sadat and his collaborators have been abandoned and that Egypt is ready not for the imposition of Egypt's *diktat* on Israel—as suggested today by the representative of Egypt, a *diktat*

that would only enable Egypt to continue its struggle against Israel, as vowed by the Egyptian leaders themselves, under more advantageous conditions—but for genuine peace, a peace arrived at through serious negotiations, as it has been always and everywhere whenever nations sought to end war and establish understanding and peace.

64. I should like to bring to the attention of the Security Council a number of additional facts regarding the responsibility of the Government of Lebanon for terror operations carried out against Israel from Lebanese territory.

65. Contrary to its obligation under international law and the Charter of the United Nations, the Lebanese Government has turned its territory into a base of continuous aggression. It is not a matter of a few individuals defying authority, but of an entire network of organizations, operational bases, training camps, headquarters and information centres functioning with the full blessing, formal sanction and open support of the Lebanese Government.

66. Of the approximately 5,000 members of terror organizations stationed in Lebanon, some 2,000 are in bases in the southern part of the country, mostly in "Fatahland". About 3,000 are deployed in eastern Lebanon on the Syrian border, in the area of Deir el Ashair. There are also terrorist bases in the center sector of the country and in refugee camps along the coast.

67. Lebanon harbours the military headquarters of the following terror organizations: Al Fatah, the Popular Front, Al-Saiqa and the Popular Front General Command. Moreover, there exists a combined military headquarters and regional headquarters in each of the two sectors—the eastern and the western.

68. The terror organizations have established their information centres in Beirut, publishing there their organs, *el-Hadaf* of the Popular Front, *Hazer el-Asifa* of Al Fatah, *el-Mugawama* of the Democratic Front, *Ila el-Amam* of the Popular Front's Central Command. Most of the official communiqués, including announcements of terror attacks, are issued in Beirut.

69. The political institutions of the terror organizations are also located in Lebanon. We find there the Executive Committee of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization and the General Congress of the Popular Front, and others.

70. Under international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the cease-fire established by the Security Council, the Government of Lebanon is responsible for permitting these organizations to carry on their nefarious activities. If the Lebanese Government tries to evade this obvious responsibility, if it refuses to abide by its international obligation to suppress the murderous operations of the terror organizations, it leaves Israel no choice but to act in self-defence.

71. Israel would be entitled to do so in any situation in which it found itself subjected to continuous attacks, just like any other Member of the United Nations would be entitled to do so. It is especially true in a situation of war

pursued against Israel by the Arab States, including Lebanon, since 1948. In this war Israel and Lebanon have agreed, at first to a truce, then to an armistice, and since 1967 to a cease fire. The war, however, has continued. It is bad enough that Lebanon still has not made peace with Israel, but it is absurd that Lebanon should try to dictate how Israel should defend itself in war.

72. This applies not only to the manner in which Israeli forces act against the sources of attacks on the territory and population of Israel but also to such matters as the taking of prisoners of war. The special interest expressed by some members of the Council in the five high-ranking Syrian officers is perhaps understandable. Their status as prisoners of war is, however, no different from the status of other war prisoners detained by the parties to the Middle East conflict.

73. The Syrian officers were taken prisoner by an Israeli patrol in a war zone, an area in which Israeli border villages have been repeatedly attacked. Moreover, the Syrian officers consisted of an operational reconnaissance mission organized jointly with the Lebanese Army. They are all high-ranking intelligence officers and all belong to the General Command Headquarters. It is to be noted that the terror attacks carried out against Israel from southern Lebanon are supervised by or co-ordinated with the General Command of the Syrian Army. The documents seized on the Syrian officers indicate that their tour included a special visit to the el-Arkoub area known as Fatahland, where they were to collect military data and work out guidelines for future operations of the terror organizations. This transpires from a document entitled: "Lebanese Republic National Defence Office. Military Command Headquarters. General Staff—Head Office No. 1/8106—AM Classification: 1-242. Re: Syrian Arab Army Officers' visit to Lebanon."

74. Another document found on them was a map of the Israeli-Lebanese-Syrian sector—scale 1:50,000—which was carried by one of the two intelligence officers of the operations branch of the Syrian Air Force. Military and civilian targets in Israeli territory, including emplacements of anti-aircraft guns, were marked on the map. In sketches and notes found on the officers and made by them in the course of their tour were, *inter alia*, descriptions of areas in Israel as seen from observation points in Lebanon, airfields and plane hangars in Israel as seen from Lebanon, take-off and landing techniques employed by Israeli pilots on those fields and radar installations.

75. It is clear, therefore, that this was a case of military officers of a Power engaged in war carrying out a war mission in a war zone. Their status is that of any other prisoners of war.

76. The Government of Israel considers that all prisoners should be released and allowed to return to their homes. Negotiations are, in fact, already under way through the International Committee of the Red Cross for the release of all the prisoners of war of all the parties.

77. The emphasis put by the representative of Lebanon and certain other representatives on the issue of the five

Syrian prisoners of war is a reflection of the selective manner in which questions arising out of the Middle East situation have been treated in the United Nations. Are only Arab prisoners of war to be of concern to the Security Council? Is the Council to address itself only to Israeli self-defence actions against murderous Arab attacks and to ignore the attacks themselves? Are one-sided resolutions adopted here or in other international organizations and resulting from this selective approach to be invoked while the fundamental principles of international law and the United Nations Charter are brushed aside?

78. Surely the representative of Lebanon and his supporters know that resolutions can be meaningful and effective only if they are equitable. If they reflect simply the numerical preponderance of a certain group they are devoid of value. It is precisely because of the insistence of Arab delegations on such resolutions that United Nations deliberations on the Middle East have become less and less productive and subjected to ever-growing criticism.

79. The Government of Lebanon knows that Israel will not accept any excuse for Lebanon's refusal to suppress terror warfare directed against Israel from Lebanese territory. Time and again Lebanon resorts to the United Nations, obtains by sheer weight of numbers a one-sided resolution and then invokes it as a pretext for evading its international obligations and for continuing to serve as a base of aggression against Israel. The experience of years should make Lebanon realize that Israel will not acquiesce in this manner of conduct and that only effective measures by the Lebanese Government to stop acts of violence and murder from its territory can arrest the deterioration of the situation.

80. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

81. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, may I start by congratulating you on assuming the high function of the Presidency of the Security Council, a post which I am sure you will occupy, as you have occupied all your posts, with distinction, objectivity and statesmanship.

82. The Syrian Government fully associates itself with the complaint submitted by Lebanon which the Security Council is now considering. The first aspect of this item on the agenda relates directly to Syria. Syria's interests and the integrity of international law are indeed directly involved also. I am referring in particular to the ambush which was prepared, carried out and implemented by regular units of the Israeli Army.

83. The facts are by now well known: Five high-ranking Syrian officers were paying a visit to the Lebanese Army in southern Lebanon; it was purely a visit, and it is in this context—not in any military context—that the matter should be assessed. Whether they were carrying maps or documents with them, or going this way or that way, the undeniable fact remains that those officers were visiting their counterparts in Lebanon.

84. It is against any norm of international law—it is against any norm of law anywhere in the world—that officers paying a visit to another country, when a battle is not taking place, should be ambushed and arrested. To judge from the words just used by the Israeli representative, he apparently has a new conception of international law about the movements of officers: namely, that Israel itself should define the lines and limits within which movements of officers of other countries' armies should be made. That is exactly as though any one of us sitting around this table should say, for instance, that the officers of the Argentine Army, or of the Panamanian Army or of the Somali Army, should not go into this or that sector of a neighbouring country, and that if they do they will be arrested. Israel's formulation of a new law is certainly part of a pattern which has become so familiar as to need no emphasis.

85. The representative of Lebanon, in his presentation of the case, gave the full details about the manner in which the arrests were made. Our officers were in civilian vehicles; they were attacked by tanks and armoured cars. The flimsy accusation by the representative of Israel that we are in a state of war and that this justifies those arrests is nothing but the kind of childish argument and very cheap lie so typical of the Israeli representative. That is why, Mr. President, in my letter to you of 22 June 1972 [S/10710] I stated:

“... I have the honour to draw your urgent attention to a shocking violation of international law and of the most elementary norms of civilized behaviour, committed by Israeli authorities at noon (local time) on 21 June 1972.

“While five Syrian officers were paying an ordinary visit to colleagues in the Lebanese army they were ambushed and abducted inside the territory of Lebanon by an Israeli military force with tanks and armoured vehicles.

“The wantonness of this act is so apparent that I need not comment, save to stress that the men were unarmed when they were taken, simply riding along in civilian cars.

“In the face of such dishonourable conduct, it seems only proper to have recourse to you as the President of the highest organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, and I request that you kindly initiate steps for the immediate release of the five officers.”

86. That remains the stand of the Syrian Government, that under no stipulation of law whatsoever could there be any justification for the detaining of these Syrian officers.

87. The representative of Israel thought that he submitted something very new by giving us the numbers of some documents and implying that they were authentic documents. I could cite scores of documents which throughout the history of Israel and of Zionism have been forged and circulated, and which have been proved to be nothing but forgeries. But even if the captured officers were carrying whatever they are said to have been carrying with them, nothing whatever in the statement of the Israeli representative justifies the savage, barbaric, uncivilized act of

attacking officers who were on a civilian visit to the territory of Lebanon.

88. We absolutely deny that Israel has the right to limit the movement of our officers, whether they are in Lebanon or in any other country in the world, for that matter. Let us suppose that they are in Yugoslavia or France or Argentina or Brazil. If the argument used by the Israeli representative to justify the arrest of the Syrian officers in Lebanon were to be accepted, then a law would be established by which Israelis could arrest anybody anywhere in the world and anybody anywhere in the world could arrest anybody he wanted to arrest. To put it simply, that is the law of the jungle.

89. Now, does the Security Council agree even to consider this flimsy, flippant, frivolous argument presented by the representative of Israel? I leave it to those who really uphold the norms of international law to draw the proper conclusions of international law on that particular matter.

90. The representative of Israel spoke about maps. I wish to draw your attention to a map attached to a letter which I addressed to the Secretary-General on 20 June 1972 [S/10704]. I have copies of it here, and for the benefit of members of the Security Council, and with your permission, Mr. President, I request that that map, which I am going to present, be made part and parcel of the statement I am making now. If you have no objection, Sir, copies of these maps could be circulated to the members of the Security Council.

91. The map to which I am referring is entitled, "Settlements established after 1967". If we turn to the map we will find that those settlements have all been established on the West Bank of the Jordan in the Golan heights, in Gaza, in Rafiah, in Sharm el-Sheikh and in part of Sinai, and the names, places and dates of the settlements are given.

92. This is not an invention; the map is taken from the report submitted by the World Zionist Organization—which is another name for the Israeli Government—to the twenty-eighth Zionist Congress, which was held in Jerusalem between 18 and 28 January 1972.

93. In that report, a whole chapter of which is attached as an annex to my letter of 20 June to the Secretary-General, details are given by Israel—by the World Zionist Organization, by the Jewish Agency—about each part of the occupied territories: the Golan heights, the Jordan Valley, Gaza and Rafiah and about what is to be exploited in each of those areas. To quote from this very unusual document—very unusual in this last quarter of the twentieth century:

"The guiding line was to develop industry in sectors which could contribute to economic independence without adversely affecting production in existing settlements.

"The new settlement activities were centred in four main areas: 1. The Golan heights, 2. The Jordan Valley Basin, 3. The Etzion Bloc, 4. Sinai." [Ibid., annex.]

94. Then the document goes on to enumerate what is to be exploited in each of those occupied Arab areas. I described this document as fantastic and I leave it to the Council to judge. I shall just read out some of its contents. At one point it says:

"The outcome of the Six-Day War directly affected settlement in Israel.

"The cease-fire lines left what were previously frontier settlements a long way from the border, with a consequent transformation of the nature of their problems."

What does that mean? It means that the 1967 armistice lines have been left a long way behind the present cease-fire line, that those have become part and parcel of Israel and that the new settlements on the new cease-fire lines are to become the borders of Israel. The report continues:

"The new wave of immigration made it possible to absorb a considerable number of immigrants in rural settlements.

"The phenomenon is a blessing for both the settler and the State, since it means increased income, higher standards of living, lower production costs and better export possibilities.

"In addition, the Department [of Settlement and Immigration] is developing other sources of non-agricultural employment, such as holiday resorts and suitable industrial enterprises." [S/10704]

95. I am not reading to the Council from a document of the East India Company established in the 16th or 17th century or of any colonial company established in the 19th century. I am reading to you from a document that was adopted between 18 and 28 January 1972, and this is the map that is attached to it. Now I ask Mr. Tekoah whether he can deny this. What about the resolutions that were adopted? They are a voluminous document. In the resolutions the distinction is established between Israel and Eretz Israel. Israel is as it now exists—Greater Israel—but still this is not Eretz Israel. A definition is given of Eretz Israel: it is to be established from the Nile to the Euphrates. So the conquest is not finished. I say this is a unique document in the history of the 20th century, and I beg the members of the Security Council and of the United Nations to read what is to be found here to see how Israel is planning a conquest. It is not satisfied with what has taken place, but a new conquest is being prepared. All these flimsy arguments we are hearing have no other purpose than to congeal for the consolidation of the conquest and the preparation of the new conquest.

96. In that letter I also quoted an American Professor, Professor Aruri, who wrote in *The New York Times* of 20 May 1972:

"Israeli expenditures for 'defence' have reached 30 per cent of her national income, the world's highest proportion. A sizable part of this cost is involved in the occupation of portions of three Arab States taken in 1967. Moreover, the Five Year Plan (1971-75) of Israel

envisages meeting increasing expenditures by \$1.2 billion annually in foreign grants and loans to solve this problem. As of this year every Israeli man, woman and child owes foreign creditors about \$1,125."

Where does it come from? From the treasury of the United States Government.

97. That I am not saying anything that is not to be found in the realm of new established historical documents is also proven by the following. On 14 April, we read, both from the Jewish Telegraph Agency and in *The New York Times*, about new arms being acquired by Israel:

"Israel has acquired American-made 172-mm self-propelled guns, which have a range of nearly 15 miles. There was some speculation that deployment of the long-range guns meant Israel could safely withdraw from the eastern bank of the Suez Canal and cover the canal from the distance. But"—and here is the great "but"—"the Chief of Staff, Lieut. Gen. David Elazar said at an artillery officers ceremony that the guns were 'not designed to draw you away from the cease-fire lines but to extend your fire power deeper into enemy territory'."

This is peace-loving Israel.

98. Now Zionism has entered history, and the whole dialectical essence of this debate and of similar debates is really a confrontation between a people, the Arab people, and Western European settlers, the Zionists of Europe. I say this purposely. I do not include the oriental Jews, for Israel time and again and its leaders have prided themselves on the fact that they are a European State. They are in the Middle East but not of the Middle East.

99. Mr. Tekoah excels in speaking about terrorism and referring to resistance movements as being terrorist. Here is the *The New York Times* of 13 February 1972. I am speaking not about 1948 or 1947 but about 13 February 1972. The report is datelined "Tel Aviv, Israel, 12 February", and reads:

"After almost 26 years of secrecy, a post office engineer and a motherly looking woman have admitted being among the 15 members of a Jewish commando group that blew up a wing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem in 1946.

"The explosion at the hotel, which was British Army headquarters in Palestine, killed 95 British officers, Jews and Arabs.

"The Jews involved in the raid were introduced at a public meeting in Tel Aviv this week by the former chief of the underground Irgun organization, Menahem Begin, now a member of Israel's Parliament. The two were Israel Levi and Sara Agassi.

"We had seven milk cans full of explosives, not milk' Mr. Levi said. 'We placed them around the central pillar of the building and I connected the timing devices set to go off in 35 minutes. The whole operation took eight minutes.'

"Mr. Levi, Miss Agassi and Mr. Begin insisted that the hotel and surrounding buildings—including the French consulate next door—had been given telephone warnings of the explosion, but the British refused to evacuate.

"Mr. Begin said the British commander brushed aside the warning, saying, 'We are here to give orders, not to take orders from the Jews.'

"Mr. Levi and Miss Agassi said the final orders for the bombing had been given in a Jerusalem synagogue by an Irgun commander named Amichai Paelin. But they gave no information on the other 12 members of the group."

For all we know, one of them might be Mr. Tekoah himself.

100. Now, there is another version which is very interesting, about the blowing up of the King David Hotel, because it constitutes a chapter of Menachem Begin's book, *The Revolt*,² the chapter entitled "The King David Hotel".

101. According to that authoritative book and that chapter, this operation was planned by Israel Galili, who was representing the Haganah, with Irgun Zvei Leumi, which was the extreme group representing the revisionist Zionists. But to deceive world public opinion Ben Gurion and company were denouncing the Irgun Zvei Leumi and in this book Menachem Begin affirms that Israel Galili was the one who planned the massacre at the King David Hotel. The figure, according to that chapter, is not 100 but 200, including 15 Jews who were killed by Jews. I am not going to speak at all about Jews and Zionists and terrorists killing Arabs, but about Zionist terrorists killing Jews, their own kith and kin. We know that in 1947 there were illegal immigrants and their ships used to be stopped at Haifa and returned to Cyprus or other places. Here is what Mr. Begin says in his book, *The Revolt*, about one such ship carrying illegal immigrants:

"The *Patria* [carrying Jewish immigrants to Palestine,] never sailed. Jewish 'terrorists' placed a bomb to prevent its departure. The bomb exploded and more than 200 Jews were killed or drowned. The British authorities noted the fact that this was not an Irgun Zvei Leumi operation; it was the Haganah which had placed the bomb."³

102. Despite Mr. Tekoah's dramatic presentation, I am sure he knows these facts and other facts which I can bring to your attention. What does this book say? A Jewish terrorist, Menachem Begin, the leader of the Irgun, a member of the Cabinet, a member of the Knesset, says that "Jewish 'terrorists' placed a bomb to prevent its departure. The bomb exploded and more than 200 Jews were killed or drowned".³ Under this brand of neurotic ideology any action can justify any end, no matter how base and low—even killing human beings, as was the case during this dastardly act.

103. All this stems from a basic philosophy. These people have a certain conception of law. One leader of the

² New York, Henry Schuman, 1951.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Haganah who wrote a book about the Haganah said: "We were conspirators outside the law but obeying what to us was a higher law." So having placed themselves as a chosen people with a higher law above mankind as a whole they can justify anything. The arrest of five high-ranking Syrian officers on Lebanese territory becomes a trifling matter when Jewish terrorists have killed 250 Jewish men, women and children. So you see the analogy, you see how flimsy, how insignificant Mr. Tekoah's statements are.

104. But there is something else, which stands in the records of this very Security Council, and it is this: On 18 September 1948 Count Folke Bernadotte and his assistant, a French colonel, were killed by the Jewish terrorists in Jerusalem as he was mediating for peace. The Security Council adopted resolution 57 (1948) of 18 September 1948 which states:

"The Security Council,

"Deeply shocked by the tragic death of the United Nations Mediator in Palestine, Count Folke Bernadotte, as the result of a cowardly act which appears to have been committed by a criminal group of terrorists in Jerusalem while the United Nations representative was fulfilling his peace-seeking mission in the Holy Land."

This is an official document of the Security Council and the United Nations and is, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, a decision of the Security Council, and refers to this band of people as "a criminal group of terrorists". A month later, on 19 October 1948, the Security Council adopted another resolution, resolution 59 (1948); in that resolution the Security Council requested "that Government to submit to the Security Council . . . an account of the progress made in the investigation" into the assassinations.

105. I know that the provisional rules of procedure of the Council do not permit a non-member to submit the following request—although I could of course submit an official letter in this respect—but if I did have the right I should like to request a written statement from you, Sir, as President of the Security Council, and from the Secretary-General as to what reply the Israeli Government gave to those two decisions of the Security Council. What happened to the assassins of Count Folke Bernadotte? I shall tell you what happened, because the matter has been fully documented by Zionist historians and I refer Mr. Tekoah to two of them. First there is Mr. Samuel Katz and his book *Days of Fire*⁴ published a few years ago. Samuel Katz is South African, like Aubrey Eban, alias Abba Eban, like Michael Comay, like Pinhas Sapir and scores of others who were brought to our part of the world with the white man's burden. Samuel Katz indicates in his book—and I have it here—that there appeared at that time a group of terrorists called the "Fatherland Front", that two of them—Friedman-Yellin and another—were arrested for the massacre of Count Folke Bernadotte. But what happened to them? Samuel Katz says, after he was elected a member of the Knesset: "My own first act as an elected member of the Assembly was to demand the release from jail of Friedman-Yellin and his lieutenant, Mattityahu Shmulevitz. The Government solved the problem by pro-

claiming a general amnesty." Later in the same book we are told that the assassin became a member of the Israeli Knesset.

106. That sounds like an unbelievable tale, but it is what the Arab world has been faced with in the last 25 years and what it is faced with right now.

107. There is other documentation about the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte from another Zionist confirming exactly what Samuel Katz said. What was the spirit at that time? We found that the order to blow up the King David Hotel was given from a synagogue. One Rabbi Eliazer Silver said at that time:

"To those who believe that we ought to excommunicate the so-called terrorists in Eretz Israel, I am forced to declare that if excommunication could be applied to those who are really responsible for the terror, that is, the Arabs and the British, we would then apply the measures against the terrorists as well. However, we must bear in mind that Irgunists"—namely those who committed the massacres of Deir-Yassin and Kfar Kassem—"and the others are really martyring themselves for the Jews and for Eretz Israel."

I could go on and on, because the history of Jewish Zionism—now Israeli terrorism—has not even been scratched. But I need only remind you of the passage I have just read out to you from *The New York Times* of 13 February 1972, showing that after 26 years the terrorists of yesterday have become ministers and members of Parliament and Ambassadors and so on. And they lecture the world about the rule of law. I wish to remind Mr. Tekoah that the Haganah, which became the official army of Israel, was founded in 1913—even before the Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate.

108. What does that mean? It means that the whole movement was conceived as a conquest, and for those who now make the proposition that Israel is there to stay, the last 25 years have established two corollaries that go hand in hand with that proposition: Israel is there to strike, Israel is there to expand. If those two corollaries are not believed, look at the map of Israel and see where the armies of Israel stand today.

109. In conclusion, I confirm the stand of the Syrian Government that it is a flagrant violation of international law to have the five Syrian army officers detained. Israel should be condemned for that act. Any State that commits such an act should be condemned. And until and unless condemnation is made clear-cut on that dastardly act, Israel will continue with the spirit of terror that has made it believe it is above the law and superior to any law, and will continue committing crime, terrorizing and committing acts of genocide against the Arabs.

110. The problem today is not really the existence of Israel; the problem now is the existence of 3 million Arabs. The Golan heights has been emptied of all its population to make room for settlers from all over the world and other parts of the occupied Arab territory. The tragic thing is that

⁴ New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.

the international community has so far not been able even to grasp the real meaning of the conquest that is taking place as a colonial conquest in the Near East, nor to understand that whenever Israel speaks of peace it is only hypocrisy, it is only a sham. That hypocrisy is proven by the documents from the twenty-eighth Zionist Congress I have submitted, by the replies that were given to Ambassador Jarring, by the stand of the Arab States, by the stand of Israel.

111. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): The United States deplores the continuing violence that has marked recent events in the Middle East. We regret that those whose fortunes ultimately depend upon the establishment of true peace and stability in the area have again chosen the path of terrorism, the path of armed force.

112. As all of us in this Council well know, terrorism has been used in a senseless pattern of death and destruction. Innocent pilgrims, including 16 of my American compatriots, lost their lives at Lod airport. At that time the Acting Secretary of State of the United States expressed the shock of my Government at that outrageous action, which he termed a murderous and indiscriminate attack on innocent civilians including women and children. For that statement, some accused the United States Government of being anti-Arab.

113. Terrorist attacks have taken their toll of human life and productive economic resources have been destroyed or diverted from serving the people of the area. We recognize that no Government can remain unconcerned about the threat of such terrorism, and no people can remain insensitive to its consequences. Several of the representatives who spoke before me mentioned the Lod airport incident. But I cannot let pass the comments about this dreadful incident made by our colleague the representative of Egypt. Unless I misunderstood him because of the interpretation, he referred to the crocodile tears that had been shed about this incident. Well, I can speak only for the people of the United States, and say that the tears that were shed here were genuine. They flowed from the heart. They were not synthetic. They were not contrived. They were not hypocritical, the tears of a crocodile. They genuinely reflected the grief and the horror of families, friends and just plain Americans who were heartbroken at the loss of the lives of 16 of their fellow citizens and at the loss of the other lives involved.

114. In contrast, we have noted that many Arab spokesmen have refused to associate themselves with the massacre at Lod airport. The perpetrators of that terrorism should gain from others only revulsion for their cause, and we denounce whatever forces sent those murderers on their maniacal mission.

115. To be sure, terrorism in the Middle East breeds its own deplorable reactions. On 22 June the United States Government spokesman stated that the United States "deeply regrets the loss of life in the Israeli attacks on Lebanon of 21 June". And for that we were accused in some quarters of unfairly censuring Israel. It is particularly tragic when innocent civilians become victims of events growing out of the continued Arab-Israeli conflict.

116. Let me now add that we deplore any further loss of life in incidents that have occurred subsequently. As I stated last February in this Council, the United States fully supports the territorial integrity and the political independence of Lebanon. My Government hopes and expects that incidents of the type have occurred along the Israeli-Lebanese border will not recur and that all forces, regular or irregular, will remain on their own sides of the frontier and that quiet will be maintained. We are aware that the Government of Lebanon has made efforts to control terrorist elements on its territory—elements whose activities are as inimical to the interests of many Arab Governments as they are to Israel. We are pleased to note the absence of cross-border incidents for nearly four months. We hope that all authorities in the area, including particularly the Government of Israel, will facilitate and not impede these efforts by Lebanon to control terrorism.

117. In these circumstances it is hard to find new suggestions, and I would revert to one made by my Government here some four months ago. We said that the United States believes that the way to solve the problem lies not in hortatory declarations or in further recourse to armed force. It lies, rather, in direct liaison and co-operation between the parties to provide the most reliable assurance possible regarding the security of each. It is the parties that must redouble their efforts to avoid a repetition of the cycle of attacks and counter-attacks. The United States therefore urges that both Israel and Lebanon have more frequent recourse to the international facilities that exist for the exchange of information and consultation on border matters, and above all we ask for an end to cross-border attacks and terrorism without which the cycle of action and reaction cannot be broken.

118. Thus we hope that the members of the Council will take only such action as will contribute to a practical solution in the area. Clearly, we should deplore acts of violence and armed attacks. In the name of justice, in the name of fair play, we must do so from whatever quarter they may appear. But that is not enough. Conditions must also be created that will put an end to these incidents, which poison relations between Israel and Lebanon.

119. In the past year several very significant steps towards world peace have been taken. New avenues of communication and dialogue have been opened and old antagonisms are being muted in the search for areas of agreement. These are what one might call the building blocks of peace.

120. Now is it too much to ask, is it too much to expect, that in the Middle East the same process should get under way to end a quarter century of bitterness? All sides must mute their weapons and get on with the important dialogue which is essential to resolving the immediate issues, including the question of prisoners, and which would help to achieve an over-all peaceful settlement in the area on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

121. We view any resolution to be adopted in the present situation as needing to be characterized by balance, by an effort to look beyond the immediate incidents, horrible as they were. In order to obtain our concurrence, a draft

resolution will simply have to include the following ingredients: It must be fair. It must be balanced. It must be concerned about terrorist acts as well as the Israeli attacks. It must show concern and compassion for those who lie dead or wounded on both sides of the border. And it must carry at least the hope of moving this whole area closer to peace.

122. At the appropriate time the United States delegation will offer a draft resolution which we feel will accomplish the ends that I have just outlined.

123. Mr. SEN (India): We are glad that this meeting is taking place formally, openly and in accordance with the established procedures. We are discussing a problem which has an important bearing in international peace and security, and it is appropriate that it should be faced and discussed and its solution sought in accordance with the Charter and the rules of the Council. Of late there have been tendencies to deviate from these normal practices, and we have expressed our concern and reservations about them.

124. Our views have been based not only on purely legal considerations, which are important, but also on our conviction that the effectiveness of the Council's decisions can best be ensured by arriving at them through proper and comprehensive discussions in which all those States can participate that are entitled to do so under the Charter. To avoid discussion on the ground that a debate might be long and acrimonious does not appear to us to be desirable. For instance, on the problem of hijacking one reason given for avoiding such a public debate—given in the corridors, no doubt—was that it might touch upon some aspects of the Middle East problem. Now we are inevitably obliged to discuss this problem in a much wider context. The basic concept of the United Nations that this is a forum where final decisions are arrived at openly and after open discussion, with the maximum relevant participation of its membership on a given problem, must be upheld. We are glad, therefore, that the Council has shown its readiness to discuss a serious situation as it should be discussed, in a formal meeting.

125. We meet here today on a specific complaint by the Government of Lebanon, followed by a counter-complaint by the Government of Israel. As the distinguished Ambassador of Lebanon has pointed out, this pattern of approach to the Council has been evident for some time now.

126. The problem of the Middle East, like many other problems of international concern, has to be viewed in its totality. It is not enough to cite the principle of self-defence, without at the same time taking into account the principle of non-admissibility of acquisition of territory by force of arms and the principle of the right of dispossessed people to be restored to their homes and lands.

127. We do not have to go again into the depth and detail of the Arab-Israeli conflict over the last quarter of a century to understand the present situation. The broad facts are, of course, well known and are to form the background of our analysis. After the long-simmering Arab-Israeli conflict once more erupted into a full-scale war

in June 1967, the Security Council worked out, with painstaking care and most detailed consideration, its resolution 242 (1967), which contained a solution to this grave problem. That solution was generally acceptable to the parties, and massively endorsed by the United Nations. If that solution has not become effective, it is solely because all attempts to ensure the withdrawal of Israel from occupied Arab territories have been frustrated.

128. In these circumstances, how can we deny to the Arabs, particularly the Palestinian Arabs, their right to reclaim their own territories? What is the extent to which any Arab Government can or should restrain its people when they are so blatantly denied what is justly theirs? This is not to say, of course, that Israel does not have the fullest right of self-defence in its own territory as defined and recognized by the United Nations. But that right surely cannot be exercised by such theories as pre-emptive or preventive strike or by a desire to teach the Lebanese such a lesson that they will no longer care or dare. There would be a little more understanding of the Israeli position if indeed its existence as a State was threatened. After the events of June 1967, it is clear even to the most uninitiated that Israel can have no such fears. One has simply to look up any of the standard books on armaments to see that Israel is many, many times more powerful than Lebanon, and that Lebanon is indeed totally helpless if faced with Israel's massive military strength. The figures given in the latest *Yearbook* of SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) of Stockholm tell their own story. Such an imbalance of power lends greater anguish to the sense of injustice and the loss of life and property to which the Lebanese are frequently subjected.

129. It is these general principles and this comprehensive approach which have informed the policy of the Government of India to the Arab-Israeli problem, and we see no reason to abandon our principles or to modify our policy. We want to see peace and justice established in the Middle East, and there cannot be any justice unless Israel withdraws from the Arab territories occupied after the June 1967 conflict and the dispossessed people of Palestine regain their rights. It is again these principles and policy which we shall apply in considering any action by the Council in relation to the specific complaints of Lebanon. The facts about these complaints have not been challenged, but an attempt has been made to justify them by the principle of self-defence. But, as I have pointed out, this principle cannot be isolated from other principles, including the principle of self-determination, which apply to these problems. Such isolation is even less justified when the Arabs have lost so much and have so much more to fear in the future. We should hope that, in spite of the experience of the last five years, the parties will once again renew their negotiations through Mr. Jarring so that Council resolution 242 (1967) can be fully and speedily implemented and these unnecessary yet deliberate killings of so many men and women, and the wanton destruction of property, can be completely eliminated. There is no element of compulsion in the killings and these acts of destruction, as has been claimed. This conclusion is further strengthened by the information which has just been circulated in documents S/7930/Add.1647 and Add.1648 of 24 June.

130. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Scarcely four months have elapsed and the Security Council has been once again convened to hold an urgent meeting in order to examine the complaints and the grievances which have been filed by Lebanon and Israel as a result of armed intervention of a typical nature against territorial sovereignty, acts of piracy and illicit intervention in civil aviation, murderous ambushes and acts of sabotage.

131. These are distressing events which cannot be repaired enough, and unfortunately they have one thing in common. That is that once again they have stricken a number of peaceful and innocent families, while at the same time moving even further and further away the possibility of bringing about a peaceful and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis.

132. There can be no doubt that the material destruction and the suffering which is the necessary accompaniment of these tragic events can be seen to be rooted in and motivated by the lasting rivalries and antagonisms persisting among the States of this region. The numerous resolutions which have been adopted both by the Security Council and by the General Assembly as the result of armed intervention or various kinds of serious incidents bring out clearly the urgent need for a negotiated solution which would be acceptable to all the parties to the case and at the same time in accordance with the provisions of Council resolution 242 (1967).

133. We cannot overlook the threats, which are becoming more and more specific and more and more urgent, before they finally lead to a confrontation which once again will cause destruction in the Near East. Therefore, my delegation would appeal to all Governments in the area to display the greatest possible degree of moderation and to co-operate fully with the United Nations in order to bring about a final settlement.

134. The Belgian Government has never ceased to repudiate energetically the military reprisal actions undertaken by Israel against Lebanon, and we have constantly exhorted all the countries in the Near East to respect fully the territorial integrity and the national sovereignty of their neighbours. My delegation hopes that the Israeli authorities will in the future refrain from resorting to interventions which run counter to the obligations which they undertook when they adhered to the Charter of the United Nations.

135. At the same time, we would address ourselves to the Lebanese Government and ask it to pass an enactment and to conclude arrangements in order to contain and effectively control the activities of the Palestinian fighters, and thus avoid acts of sabotage and ambush against civilian targets being organized from its territory. In the atmosphere of genuine emotion which has been created by recent tragic acts committed against civil aviation—the hijacking of a Sabena plane and the lamentable death of 25 people at Lod airport—the international community expects that some visible effort will be made by the Lebanese leaders.

136. Furthermore, my Government considers the request of Syria and Lebanon that the officers and policemen captured on 21 June in the interior of Lebanese territory be liberated as a legitimate one. Yesterday evening, Amba-

sador Tekoah, in both eloquent and moving terms, gave us a picture of a peaceful Israel whose entire population is working, from school-age upwards, towards comprehension and harmonious co-operation between Jews and Arabs. We hope that it is precisely the sentiments which were professed by the representative of Israel that will prompt his Government to free prisoners and to give them back to the Lebanese authorities. At the same time, Belgium supports the suggestion which was put forward the day before yesterday by the representative of Syria to the effect that the President of the Security Council should use his good offices with the representative of Israel in order to ensure that these senior Syrian officers are released.

137. In underlining the importance of the mission carried out by the observer posts of the United Nations in the Lebanese-Israeli sector, Belgium expects that the meetings organized within the context of the Mixed Armistice Commission will become even more frequent and will be enlarged in order to consider in more detail those problems which lie at the root of the regrettable events which are becoming more and more frequent.

138. In conclusion, may I once again underline the particular interest which my Government attaches to a comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem. The disturbing signs of exploding passion and terror are reappearing. It is high time that the sound of guns be stifled and that the message of peace be heard. Since November 1967, the Security Council has unanimously erected a valuable instrument which will make it possible for the Middle East, after about 25 years of war and hatred, to be transformed into an area of peace and prosperity. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, on 8 February 1971, took the necessary initiatives in order to bring closer together the views held by the main parties concerned.⁵ Let us hope that the varied resources of the creative imagination of the human genius will be fully explored and exploited in order to serve the cause of peace. This is indeed the most ardent wish of the Belgian Government.

139. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): It was only four months ago that the Security Council had to deal with a complaint of Lebanon on a serious incident in the border area between Lebanon and Israel.

140. My delegation regrets deeply that once again the Council has been seized of a similar incident in the same sector. From the statements we heard last night, as well as the UNTSO (United Nations Truce Supervision Organization) observers' reports now available to us, it seems clear that a large-scale military operation was carried out on 21 to 23 June by Israeli armed forces against Lebanon.

141. The delegation of Japan deplores all actions, particularly indiscriminate attacks, which result in the loss of innocent lives. Violations of the cease-fire should be stopped, regardless of their origin or motive.

142. As a step to sever the vicious and deplorable cycle of action and retaliation, my delegation believes that the Council should urgently call upon Israel to desist and

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

refrain from any ground and air military actions against Lebanon. Israel should also be urged to take prompt measures conducive to a return to normalcy, including the release of the captured Syrian and Lebanese officers.

143. In the previous meetings of the Council which were held to discuss the similar question on 26 and 27 February 1972, my delegation advocated the need for stationing an adequate number of United Nations observers on the border in this sector, in the hope that such measures would provide an important means of deterring incidents and of maintaining the cease-fire. It is gratifying to note that, on the basis of the consensus of the members of the Security Council arrived at on 19 April 1972, three new observation posts have been established in this sensitive sector. The verified observations reported from these three observation posts, which have become available to us since 22 April, are telling evidence of the usefulness of such a mechanism and my delegation wishes to place on record its full appreciation of UNTSO's dedicated services in the discharge of its duty.

144. The renewed incident on the border of Israel and Lebanon has once again demonstrated the urgent need for implementation of a just and lasting peace which should be brought about on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

145. My delegation again appeals to all the parties concerned in the area to exercise the utmost self-restraint and refrain from any action which may further aggravate the present highly sensitive situation.

146. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 28 February 1972 the delegation of Panama voted in favour of resolution 313 (1972) of the Security Council in order to increase the number of United Nations observers located in the frontier area between Israel and Lebanon, since we were convinced that this would contribute to a reduction of the violence in that area. Unfortunately, we can see today that although this measure was useful it did not in fact help to calm animosity between the two countries. The events of the last few weeks have filled us with sorrow.

147. My government has repeatedly condemned all forms of armed action in the Middle East. We have stated resolutely that we are against terrorism and we have also requested that the cease-fire be respected. It is our genuine desire that a lasting and effective peace should be brought about between our friends in Israel and in the Arab countries. It was with great distress that we condemned the slaughter of innocent persons at Lod airport on the thirtieth of May last, where 16 of our Latin American brothers lost their lives. We respectfully ask the Government of Lebanon to do everything in its power to prevent Palestinian combatants who enjoy the hospitality of that country from using its territory in order to launch attacks against Israel.

148. In the same way and in the same spirit of frankness we also ask Israel to exercise due control over its armed forces in order to avoid any repetition of military incursions against its neighbours in Lebanon. Panama declares emphatically that the territorial integrity of Lebanon should be

respected by all States on earth. In order to exercise moderation, my delegation believes that we ought to express our support for the idea of new negotiations with the representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, so as to enable him to work towards a speedy solution of the Middle East problem within the context of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. We consider that for the time being this is the most effective way that we have available to put an end to the violent incidents which have occurred in that tense region of the world.

149. We should like to assure you, Mr. President, in conclusion, that Panama will study with genuine interest and will support any constructive draft resolution which would help to strengthen peace in the Middle East.

150. Mr. DIOP (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): At a time when the Security Council is once again taking up the question of the Middle East, the delegation of the Republic of Guinea would first like to express its disquiet at the serious situation which at present prevails in that part of the world.

151. Furthermore, my delegation listened with sustained interest to the accounts by the representatives of Lebanon and Israel of the conflict which has brought these two States into confrontation. Without going into detail, the delegation of the Republic of Guinea deplores the repeated acts of aggression by Israel against Lebanon, because it is a secret to no one that Israel is an expansionist State. Since the partition of Palestine on 29 November 1947, every Israeli-Arab war has been the occasion for Israel to increase its territory at the expense of the Arab nations.

152. It is not my intention by any means to refer here to the background of those events. I should merely like to recall a few facts. In point of fact, on 5 June 1967 Israel attacked three Arab States by surprise and despite the cease-fire which was proclaimed on 7 June its armed forces continued to advance in order to ensure their control over more territory. In July 1967 the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly laid down very clearly the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and asked for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied territories. On 22 November 1967 the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 242 (1967), which reaffirmed the same principle. But despite all the efforts made by the United Nations and the Security Council to restore peace to the Middle East, Israel continues deliberately to violate all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and to behave like a genuine colonial Power in the territory. By successive acts of military aggression it has increased in size, to the detriment of its neighbours, and now it wishes to annex the southern part of Lebanon. Thus, on 25 February 1972 the Security Council had to meet to consider the complaint of Lebanon against Israel because its territory had been violated, and since that time there have continually occurred on the Israeli-Lebanese frontier incidents carried out by Israeli forces, which continue to violate Lebanese territory by infiltrating through the frontier villages into Lebanese territory in order to indulge in the most horrible acts of destruction against the innocent population of Lebanon.

153. The acts of brigandage that have been committed in recent days by the Zionist forces in Lebanese territory, the abduction of Syrian and other officers, the mass bombing of villages, sowing death and destruction among the peace-loving Lebanese population, are sufficiently well known to us all and do not leave us indifferent.

154. That is why my delegation would once again condemn the criminal acts perpetrated by Israel against Lebanon and would ask the Security Council to take the necessary decisive steps. First, we would request the condemnation of Israel, in view of all the crimes it has committed against Lebanon. Secondly, we would request the immediate freeing of the five officers kidnapped by the Israeli Army, the cessation of hostilities on the part of Israel against Lebanon, and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories.

155. Finally, my delegation would like to stress that the Government of the Republic of Guinea supports, and will continue to support, the just cause of the Arab countries in their struggle against Zionism, which is a genuine danger to international peace and security.

156. Mr. VINCI (Italy): Whenever we meet, what we hear most is a sad, depressing story of the loss of human lives, of bloodshed, and of the destruction of properties in this or that area of the world. This, unfortunately, is especially the case of the Middle East area.

157. What we have heard yesterday and today is nothing less than a confirmation, throughout too many years, of this sad story, with an increase in the number of casualties and of suffering, especially among innocent, helpless civilian people.

158. We cannot fail to associate ourselves with the expressions of sincere regret voiced in this chamber and to deplore and condemn all acts of violence leading to the death and maiming of innocent people. We cannot at the same time condone any sort of reprisals—the more so when they are in violation of the principles and provisions of the Charter and are out of proportion to the motivations invoked.

159. We have had to note lately how violence has regrettably been spreading, even beyond the area of conflict, into an endless international dispute causing the loss of lives and the disruption of normal life in other parts of the world, and affecting peaceful trade and international civil aviation, which has been a great achievement of man's genius and has helped enormously to foster world progress and better understanding and co-operation among all peoples.

160. My delegation must state clearly here that this spiral of violence, which sometimes falls beyond the possible control of the main governments concerned, is to the advantage of no one. It is true to say that most of this violence finds its root causes in the lack of progress towards the peaceful settlement of a disquieting situation that has been for too long drifting and deteriorating.

161. My country has often appealed, and will continue to appeal, earnestly to all parties in the Middle East to make

all efforts to move out of the present stalemate and to set themselves firmly on the path to peace, relying in the first place on the machinery created by the United Nations, but also on their own statesmanship, imagination, courage and determination.

162. If all this is true, it is also true that the violence erupting now and then out of a situation of frustration serves no useful purpose; the death and destruction it has been causing through the years has not improved the chances of bringing peace and justice to the area. Rather, it might even damage equally the chances of all the parties to assert their legitimate interests and to enable their peoples to enjoy peace at last and to dedicate all their resources and energies to their economic and social development.

163. How long will public opinion stand these negative developments? What can be done to rescue a situation that risks becoming uncontrollable by all the responsible Governments in the region? In our opinion—and we have stressed this on many occasions—there is only one way to put an end to this alarming situation: to eradicate the source of violence which breeds violence. The parties must give full implementation, in all its parts, to resolution 242 (1967). We have never ceased to advocate the full co-operation of the parties with Ambassador Jarring to achieve this objective. We fully share, therefore, the view expressed by the Secretary-General that conditions must be created—and the earlier the better—for the resumption and reactivation of the Jarring Mission.

164. As far as Lebanon is concerned, we notice regretfully that not even the increase in the number of United Nations observers has had the expected result of reversing the pattern of violence. We have even witnessed in recent days an escalation of violence since, for the first time, Lebanese military personnel have been involved in these incidents and have been the target of attacks. The UNTSO observers were not able, as their reports show, to give us a complete picture of the events that took place on the 21st, 22nd, 23rd and, I understand, even today. In all fairness, we must recognize that the UNTSO Chief of Staff had warned that the establishment of the three observation posts could not provide comprehensive coverage of the armistice demarcation line, as indicated in his report to the Secretary-General, mentioned in paragraph 7 of the annex to document S/10611 of 19 April 1972.

165. I wonder whether some thought should not be given to this unsatisfactory situation. It could perhaps be corrected by a more adequate United Nations presence in the sector—one that could not only keep the Organization fully informed on events in that troubled border area but could also bring back normal conditions to a country with which Italy has the closest ties of friendship, to a people whose vocation of peace, so eloquently voiced yesterday by Ambassador Ghorra, is well known and highly appreciated by us and, I believe, by the international community as a whole.

166. In the meantime my delegation would be ready—responding to your appeal, Mr. President—to support a draft resolution which, even if it did not reflect completely the position of my delegation as I tried to explain it, would

produce two results: first, command the compliance of the parties and, in particular, convince the Israeli Government to put an end to the large-scale military operations against Lebanese territory and population and, second, induce the parties concerned, in the contacts we understand are under way, to act in the spirit of the relevant Geneva Convention and proceed to an exchange of prisoners. These are two results which we feel would somehow contribute to the lessening of tension and the establishment of a better climate in an area which deserves to live and work in peace.

167. Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again the Security Council has been called upon to deal with incidents of serious proportions in the Middle East. The first thought that comes to mind is how long will the situation continue in that area of the world so beset by problems, an area which has all the necessary resources and elements to develop a peaceful and prosperous existence, but which nevertheless seems fated for a tragic destiny imposed on it for decades, by a drift towards permanent unrest and instability in which human lives seem to lose their value and violence erupts all about.

168. The last time the Security Council dealt with new manifestations of that violence, in February last, the representative of Argentina had occasion to state the position of my country on this matter and to state in detail our view regarding the standards and norms which international law and the United Nations Charter impose in matters such as the one that is now being considered by the Security Council.

169. I shall not repeat what we stated on 28 February. I shall limit myself to reiterating our firm opinion that both punitive expeditions and preventive war are totally incompatible with the purposes, principles and prescriptions of the United Nations Charter.

170. On this basis it is only fair to demand an immediate suspension of operations of this character, as well as the return without delay of the officers captured by Israel on 21 June.

171. However, we believe that the responsibility of the Security Council does not end with the adoption of a resolution providing for these measures. This would mean dealing only with what is an episode and avoiding the principal subject. The situation in the Middle East has persisted in its various stages for 25 years. Since 1967 there have been no changes in the situation, and resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council, which the delegation of Argentina so strongly advocated, remains a dead letter and not a step has been taken to implement it.

172. Meanwhile, the territories of some States continue to be under the occupation of another, and the most sacred principle for a country, the inviolability of its territory, is thereby constantly violated. Therefore, nobody can be surprised at the repetition of incidents and by the fact that the blood of innocent civilians on both sides and even of parties alien to the conflict continues to be shed, with no end in sight.

173. Only a few weeks ago there occurred the tragic Lod airport episode, which called for the most energetic

repudiation by the Government of my country because of this new manifestation of irrational violence. Israelis and non-Israelis lost their lives at that time. Today it is citizens of Lebanon that are paying with their lives for other acts of violence or, in the best of cases, seeing their homes destroyed and their villages ruined.

174. Does this mean anything? Can this violence continue forever, with the ever-present risk that perhaps some day things will get out of control and a conflict will break out the extent of which is impossible to forecast?

175. The responsibility of all is very great. I certainly do not exclude that of the Security Council or that of the delegation of Argentina. It is only when we are all prepared to share our responsibilities with a full awareness of the principles at stake and the underlying realities and higher interests of mankind that a far-reaching step will have been taken towards a definitive solution of the situation in the Middle East.

176. My delegation will consider any draft resolution submitted to the Security Council in the light of the considerations I have just stated.

177. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I should like to make a brief statement of the position of my delegation on the matter before us.

178. The debate last night [*1648th meeting*] and today has ranged somewhat beyond the immediate matter that brought us together. For example, some speakers have spoken of the need for a just settlement of all the problems of the Middle East. It is undoubtedly true—and it is worth underlining this—that the present senseless escalation of violence and reprisals can best be ended through a just and lasting settlement of these problems in accordance with resolution 242 (1967). As I have had occasion to say before in the Council, all those who have the cause of peace at heart should co-operate with Ambassador Jarring in his mission, and I hope that the representative of the USSR was right in expressing the belief last night that there were good prospects for the reactivation of that important mission.

179. Reference has also been made in our debate to the acts of violence perpetrated on Israel's territory. My delegation's position has been made clear before now. We deplore all such acts of violence. Particular reference has been made to the appalling incident that occurred at Lod airport at the end of May. On this too my Government's position has been made publicly known. My Government has unreservedly condemned the indiscriminate killing and expressed its sympathy with the relatives of the killed and the injured. I repeat that today.

180. What has immediately precipitated these meetings of the Council has been the series of Israeli actions in recent days. It was perhaps not entirely clear from the statements of the representative of Israel how close a connexion he saw between these actions and in particular the senseless massacre at Lod airport. If they were intended as retaliatory action and reprisals, the representative of Israel cannot expect my delegation or any other delegation in this

Council to take anything but the most serious view of such actions and of the loss of innocent life that they have involved.

181. The representative of Israel spoke of the responsibility of the Government of Lebanon to take measures to ensure that the territory of Lebanon is not used for hostile actions against Israel. But it can hardly be suggested that acts of reprisal are an appropriate or even an effective method of encouraging such measures. That being said, however, my Government hopes for its part that the Lebanese Government will indeed step up its efforts and take all possible measures to prevent terrorist activity from being launched against Israel from Lebanese territory.

182. It has been suggested that the actions beginning on 21 June were taken in the exercise of the right of self-defence. That is indeed an indisputable right and there is no doubt that provocative incidents have taken place along the Israeli-Lebanese border in the past. But my delegation feels that these actions have gone beyond what can be justified as a legitimate exercise of the right of self-defence, particularly in relation to the specific incidents referred to in the Israeli Ambassador's letter.

183. A particularly grave aspect of the actions of recent days was the forcible removal of Lebanese and visiting Syrian officers from Lebanese territory. My Government fervently hopes that discussions now in progress will have a fruitful outcome and that the officers will be released.

184. However understandable the indignation of the entire Israeli people, as indeed of the world at large, at the massacre at Lod airport, however one may evaluate the claims that the perpetrators of this and other acts of violence had had some connexion with Lebanon before they entered Israel, whether or not the Lebanese Government has been entirely successful in preventing the use of Lebanese territory for the launching of terrorist activity against Israel, my delegation cannot accept that the Israeli actions, and not least the scale of them, were justifiable. In saying that, I in no way qualify the deep sympathy that the British Government and people feel and have expressed for the innocent victims of recent acts of terrorism and the grave concern with which we deplore such acts.

185. In our deliberations here it is right that we should concentrate on the immediate subject that has brought us here, but I should like to end as I began by echoing what other speakers have said on the overriding importance of devoting our continuing efforts to achieving a just and lasting settlement of the problems of the long-troubled area of the Middle East.

186. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no other names on the list of speakers, I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as the representative of YUGOSLAVIA.

187. There is no need for me now to enter into all the details of the situation under consideration at present since the state of affairs, the events that brought about this urgent meeting of the Security Council, are very clear. Once more we are confronted, this time in a culminating form,

with the inexcusable deeds of a policy of aggression, a policy of force, a policy of utter disregard for all obligations under the Charter and all precepts of international law and morality—that is, the Israeli policy of domination, territorial expansion and ruthless occupation of the Arab lands, resulting from an aggressive war.

188. This policy has been condemned by the international community for a score of years now in many resolutions of the highest United Nations organs. How many times have we condemned the planned and premeditated attacks launched by Israel against its neighbours? What gives rise this time to our special outrage and condemnation is the scale and brutality of the attack, causing so many deaths and the large scale destruction of villages. It would be ironic, were it not so tragic and cold-blooded, that a policy which it is repeatedly claimed is designed to prevent the destruction of a small country is precisely the policy of the most arrogant, and now rampant, aggressive impulse of fire and sword. Such a policy has often been tried in history and many times it has not succeeded even when employed by big countries against small ones. What future, what tomorrow, will it bring to those who so recklessly employ it on behalf of Israel today?

189. It is rightly said, with ever increasing evidence, that Israel is left in almost complete isolation, that there are now few who would support either the morality or the realism of its policies. We all know why. If there was ever any need for additional reasons, these were, unfortunately, abundantly supplied by Israel's merciless attacks of 21, 22 and 23 June.

190. There is no need for me to repeat the details of those attacks and the great suffering and damage caused. The representative of Lebanon and other speakers, the supplemental information from UNTSO and the press of the whole world have extensively reported on them. Moreover, those facts are not seriously disputed by anyone.

191. Attempts are being made to justify the Israeli attacks and Israel's arrogant arrogation of the so-called right to "last resort" punitive actions. But the increasing scale and frequency of Israeli attacks, the enormity of destruction and the loss of life among peaceful villagers, and the vengeful pride accompanying them, are persuading even those who have been willing to give Israel the benefit of the doubt that what we are dealing with here is a special and notably dangerous case of an aggressive policy of military means and methods, employed to conquer and keep.

192. It is that policy, the policy of rejecting all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, of open defiance of the United Nations, which is the root cause of all the tensions and violence afflicting the area. By keeping the Arab lands under its occupation, by raining retribution upon the heads, lives and possessions of the people of Palestine and its neighbours, by cruelly suppressing the legitimate and rightful struggle of the population for the liberation of their occupied territories, Israel, by its conduct, is responsible for the tragic state of affairs there. While regretting the loss of innocent civilian lives and deploring it in individual circumstances, we have to keep in mind the basic facts and causes responsible for the

developments in the Middle East. While not condoning every act of individual terrorism, we must never deny to people the right to fight for their liberation and freedom against the large-scale terrorism of occupation and aggression.

193. The other reason for the tragic situation obtaining in the whole area is the fact that the Middle East problem is not being solved, has not even been eased and that the wound is allowed to fester.

194. So we have a situation with its own most dangerous inner logic: Israel refuses to comply with the decisions of United Nations organs, to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967), even after the Arab countries have clearly and unequivocally expressed their readiness to achieve peace through peaceful means, in the interests of all States in the area. Israel does so because it is bent upon the occupation and annexation of the occupied Arab territories. And that, in its turn, can be based only on the permanent and aggressive use of force, planned and premeditated. Thus such a policy has both as its aim and as its consequence the frustration of any possibilities for a peaceful solution of the crisis.

195. We have already said many times that the gravest possible error on the part of the Security Council would be to tolerate this, to acquiesce somehow in the evident Israeli aim of conditioning us all, the whole world, to the "normalcy" of their repeated attacks, of creating a feeling of *déjà vu*, of helplessness, even of being grateful for this as a substitute for some even worse deeds.

196. No. By the sheer repetition and increasing ferocity of the Israeli attacks the whole of the Middle East is accumulating graver and graver explosive material. It especially threatens the peace and security of us all in the Mediterranean, the wide region where stability is already jeopardized by the intensifying competition of outside factors. The Middle East, the Mediterranean and Europe constitute a broad, interdependent region. Without peace and stability in every one of them it is impossible to achieve solidly-based security in each of them. That is why my country, with other non-aligned countries of the area, insists that the interrelated problems of the whole broad area must be dealt with as a whole whenever and wherever considered. And while we would like to see the Mediterranean a sea of peace—even more so since, of course, the Middle East crisis threatens not only the region of the Mediterranean and Europe, in which my country is located, but world peace generally—it is the age-old experience that the greater the ferocity of occupation all the stronger is the liberation struggle. So, as on many previous occasions, one must ask oneself what are the real intentions of Israel, what it hopes to achieve. Not peace, certainly.

197. The policy of conquest, of occupation, of massive subjugation has always in the end resulted in tragic consequences for the perpetrators. It is because we want a just peace and security and because we want them for everybody in the Middle East and elsewhere that we so strongly think that the aggressive Israeli policy must be condemned and that the Security Council must endeavour

now and constantly to try to find a means of stopping Israel from descending on the road of great irresponsibility. Travelling along that road increasingly alone it is at the same time jeopardizing its own security and jeopardizing the security of the world at large. We must not tolerate Israel's stubborn defiance of all the appeals, requests and demands to change its course and discontinue its policy of terrorizing Arab populations in the vain hope that by so doing it will divide them and make them its willing slaves.

198. We therefore strongly urge the Council to condemn the latest Israeli attacks, to ask for the immediate cessation of Israeli aggressive acts against Lebanon and other neighbouring countries, to warn Israel most forcefully to avoid any repetition, to take measures to prevent further aggressions and, in the present situation, to release immediately all the prisoners it has taken as a result of its latest aggression.

199. In closing my statement I should particularly like to stress one thing. We have so many times discussed the issue of various repetitive Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon and other Arab countries that there is almost a tendency to view it as a routine matter calling for routine meetings and routine resolutions. There is also a tendency to consider the issue as a regional and local one—not really dangerous, not liable to engulf us all in a general calamity. That tendency may be strengthened, especially since we have had very important and real breakthroughs in reducing confrontations between major Powers, which we all welcome. But it is precisely because we do think there have been considerable improvements in the general situation that we also think that there is now a better opportunity and greater urgency to exert new, more vigorous efforts and not an excuse for doing nothing to solve the Middle East crisis, the further aggravation of which is constantly threatening world peace.

200. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): In addition to what I said last night I should like to make a few remarks. In reviewing the debate on the question on our agenda it is clear that most of the statements made before the Council last night and today express concern for the growing tension in the Middle East which might lead to dangerous confrontations and great risks of renewed and wider fighting in the region.

201. In the view of the Somali delegation, the new acts of unprovoked aggression against Lebanon confirm once more that Israel, supported materially and morally by certain imperialist Western Powers and by international Zionism, does not want peace. What Israel wants is to implement first and foremost its aggressive policy of territorial aggrandizement. The Israeli leaders often declare that they have no expansionist policy, that they have no territorial aims, while they continue to occupy large regions of Arab countries, while they have changed completely the status of the city of Jerusalem, while they have deported and forcibly expelled thousands of Arabs from the occupied territories in order to settle in those territories citizens of the Zionist State and to provide for the expansion of Zionism—all this in contravention of existing international conventions and Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

202. In this connexion the delegation of the Somali Democratic Republic would like to draw the attention of the Security Council to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which, among other things, reaffirms:

"... that the territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, that the territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force, that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal...". [General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 5.]

Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories as a result of armed aggression against the Arab States is not only in contravention of that provision but also seriously contravenes the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

203. The Government and people of the Somali Democratic Republic are deeply grieved by the enormous suffering that has been inflicted upon the people of Palestine.

204. We cannot, therefore, conclude our intervention without mentioning the grave injustice done to the people of Palestine as a result of the imposition of the Zionist State of Israel upon Palestine. Israel not only continues to refuse to take any steps to redress the great wrong done to the Palestinians, whose homes and lands have been given illegally to Jewish immigrants from Europe, but also expresses surprise at their anger and at their few measures of self-defence, measures taken by the organizations which represent over 1.5 million dispossessed Palestinian refugees.

205. The Security Council should not, as I said last night, allow these wrongs to be continually committed without a strong condemnation, because if armed aggression can achieve the purpose of the aggressor and if the Council allows such aggression to be carried out without condemnation, then the world will be faced with international chaos, disorder and lawlessness. The Security Council should use its authority to condemn Israel for its unlawful acts. For, if the Zionist aggressors are allowed to escape condemnation, the authority of the Security Council and the prestige of the United Nations as a whole will be considerably weakened, if not totally destroyed.

206. The delegation of the Somali Democratic Republic will have enormous difficulties about associating itself with any draft resolution which does not condemn Israel for its premeditated act and repeated attacks against Lebanon, and for kidnapping Syrian officers in a foreign country.

207. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Somalia was the last speaker on my list. I shall proceed now to call on those representatives who have expressed a wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

208. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I should like to refer very briefly to the statement I made a few minutes ago. I mentioned the use by the Ambassador of Egypt of

the words "crocodile tears" in describing reactions to the Lod airport incident. In my statement I used some such words as "unless I misunderstood the interpretation". Apparently I did misunderstand it, because the Ambassador of Egypt, following my statement, assured me that his words were not intended to describe all the reactions to that incident, and were certainly not intended to describe the tears shed in the United States over that incident. I should like publicly to acknowledge the Ambassador's clarification and to state that, while I fully stand by the contents of my statement regarding our views on the incident itself, I fully accept his explanation that he was not speaking about the reaction in the United States. I regret that I misinterpreted his remarks, and I think it is only fair and just that I tell him this publicly and thank him for his clarification.

209. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Egypt to take a place at the Council table and to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

210. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): The representative of Israel spoke once again about the annihilation of Jews and the eradication of Israel, while the annihilation of Arabs and the eradication of their presence as the rightful owners of the land are a matter of record. A quick glance at what is happening in the occupied territories presents clear evidence of Israeli intentions—campaigns of mass destruction and mass eviction and the total changes in the demographic character and geographic structure that are taking place in these Arab territories. Yet the theory and the fantasy of the annihilation of Jews and the eradication of Israel are still used by the Israeli representative, as though the world had not yet been saturated by the fallacious claims disseminated by the Zionist institution ever since the Second World War. Since that time the world has grown accustomed to the endless repetition and reiteration of Zionist propaganda.

211. As for the Palestinian people, they are definitely entitled to their basic rights as human beings. They are entitled to their inalienable rights in accordance with the Charter, its principles and purposes, as well as the resolution of the General Assembly [2625 (XXV)] which upholds the rights of all peoples, including the Palestinian people, to struggle for their liberation and self-determination.

212. The representative of Israel spoke about history. While history shows with the utmost clarity how Israel usurped the Arab lands, evicted hundreds and thousands of Arabs, waged a war of destruction against the people of Palestine, the Arabs did not at any time wage war against Jews as such. No less a source than Mr. Ben Gurion himself bears witness to that. In his book, *The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, he declared:

"Until the British left, no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Haganah... captured many Arab positions...."

"The Arab flight from Palestine began as soon as fighting broke out, and, as the Haganah went forward, it became a rout."⁶

⁶ New York, Philosophical Library, 1954, pp. 530 and 532.

213. The representative of Israel spoke about an alleged *diktat* of Egypt. This *diktat* is nothing but the full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and other United Nations resolutions. This *diktat* is co-operation with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring. This *diktat* is nothing but the strict application of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. If this is the *diktat* to which the representative of Israel objects, Israel's real designs of aggression and expansion are obviously exposed. It is further proof of his pattern of falsification and misuse of words and events.

214. Finally, it is not my intention to enter into polemics with the representative of Israel. The Council has a task to perform and I wish it all success.

215. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Kuwait to take a place at the Council table and to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

216. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): It is not my intention to indulge in acrobatic and semantic and verbal somersaults, although I am an old athlete. The Ambassador of Israel mentioned my country in his unholy intervention and I have to exercise my right of reply.

217. I am tempted to intervene in the exercise of the right of reply by the fact that, as is his wont, the Ambassador of Israel launched some of his tirades against my country. He mentioned that Kuwait raises financial assistance for the guerrillas or, as he terms them, the terrorists. Indeed, we do not deny that. We do not deny our sympathy with our kith and kin. We are perhaps Bedouins, not sophisticated enough to conceal our designs. But we have the undisputed honesty to say what we harbour publicly and forthrightly. We are proud that by doing so we uphold the principles in which we believe, the principles that emanate from the Charter of the United Nations.

218. The crux of the problem, as I mentioned earlier, lies in the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians in accordance with the United Nations resolutions. By rendering assistance, we undoubtedly observe the spirit and letter of these resolutions. Peace will prevail only if Israel recognizes these rights and, accordingly, respects the aspirations of the Palestinians. It is not the fanaticism of Yasser Arafat, it is not the fanaticism of Habash, that engineered the whole problem. The whole problem was masterminded by a well-hatched plot the foundations of which were set early in this century.

219. In 1917, Sir Herbert Samuel left the Cabinet of the British and went to Weizmann, who was waiting in a nearby room, and he told him: "It's a boy". That was the Balfour Declaration. And what a boy, what a naughty boy, was born. I hope it had polio in its childhood.

220. Peace will prevail only if Israel recognizes these rights and, accordingly, respects the aspirations of the Palestinians. He spoke about Kuwait's refusal of resolution 242 (1967). I state that we are not a direct party to the conflict that was climaxed in 1967 and Mr. Jarring has never contacted my Government.

221. But what about his Government? When did his Government accept resolution 242 (1967)? Let him spell that out forthrightly instead of supplying evasive answers to the Jarring memoranda. If Israel wants to label Kuwait as its *bête noire*, this will not alter the truth that Israel, expansionistic Israel, Zionist Israel, is the *raison d'être* of the Middle East tragedy. Once Israel ceases its expansionistic designs and withdraws from Arab territories, and admits the rights of the Palestinians, and implements these rights, peace will be the permeating aspect of the Middle East, and the resentment subsequently will disappear. Peace and the rights of the Palestinians are intertwined. The former generates from the latter. If peace is a nostalgia of Tel Aviv, let it be peace combined with the rights of the Palestinians.

222. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Lebanon and I now call on him in exercise of his right of reply.

223. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): While we were listening to the statements of the representative of Israel yesterday and to his statement today, and to his description of Lebanon—Lebanon which has been called the land of peace and friendliness, the land of freedom, the playland of the Middle East—I had the impression that Lebanon had, all of a sudden, been transformed into a gangland, a gangland where such terrorist organizations as the Stern Gang, the Irgun Zvei Leumi, the Haganah, are mushrooming in our midst. I had the impression that those gangs that transformed Palestine and the Middle East into an area of terror warfare and turmoil had taken root in my own country, amongst my people—the people whom Ambassador Vinci of Italy, just a little while ago, described as a people following a vocation of peace.

224. Mr. Tekoah has spoken about Lebanon and above all those so-called headquarters of terror organizations and terrorist groups, international, national and regional. This is an insult to peaceful and peace-loving Lebanon, to the peace-loving Government and people of Lebanon. This is a slanderous attack against my country and my people, and any reference in this Council to terrorism in Lebanon is viewed very gravely by my Government and my people.

225. My colleagues from the Arab States have dealt very amply with the many distortions, allegations and falsehoods that Mr. Tekoah, the representative of Israel, advanced yesterday and today. Ambassador Tomeh, in his usual scholarly and thorough manner, has exposed the long history of terrorist activities started by Israeli gangs in Palestine and in the Middle East. It is those terrorist gangs which have driven 1.5 million Palestinians out of their ancestral homes and away from their properties, and sent them into exile in neighbouring countries where they have been living in squalor, in poverty and in misery on small, petty rations furnished them by the international community. They have been there for 25 years awaiting justice—the justice and the fairness that has never come to them.

226. When we want to speak about justice and fairness let us speak about justice and fairness for the 1.5 million Palestinians who have been deprived of their lands and their

homes, and who have been living in such poor and miserable conditions.

227. Mr. Tekoah always likes to bring out from his bag all these slogans about the Arabs who want to exterminate the people of Israel. I wish to quote here from an article which appeared in the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* on 13 March 1972 under the title, "The claim that Israel was under the menace of destruction is a 'bluff'":

"The thesis that in June 1967, Israel came under a threat of destruction, and that the State of Israel fought for its physical survival, is a 'bluff' which was born and developed only after the war," said Reserve General Dr. Matityahu Peled, a lecturer on the history of the Middle East at the University of Tel Aviv and a researcher in the Shiloah Center.

"Dr. Peled spoke in a symposium on . . . *The Israelis*, which was published recently by Schocken and stirred a wide controversy among its critics and readers.

"Furthermore, Dr. Peled claimed that, in May 1967, the Israelis were not under a threat of destruction 'neither as individuals nor as a nation. The Egyptians concentrated only 80,000 soldiers in Sinai, and we mobilized hundreds of thousands of men against them'. . . . The fact that there was no real danger of destruction caused much difficulty for the Government which had adopted the 'Diaspora Approach'. According to this approach, war can be justified only when there is a threat of extermination and it should not be waged because of political reasons."

But for political reasons the Government of Israel waged its aggression against the three Arab States in 1967.

228. In his statement yesterday, Mr. Tekoah went into the fantasy that Lebanon had ignored, repudiated and trampled upon international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Now, such a fantasy had to be exposed. I should like to ask Mr. Tekoah to give me even one example of Lebanon's being accused of committing any act against international law or the Charter of the United Nations; let him cite a single instance when Lebanon appeared here as the accused or the defendant; let him cite a single incident when the Council condemned Lebanon for any such act against international peace and security. I know that Mr. Tekoah cannot cite such cases because our record is clean; there are no spots on our record in the United Nations.

229. On the other hand, I could go on indefinitely citing resolutions and decisions of the United Nations containing condemnations of Israel. The total number of resolutions and decisions on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestine question adopted by the General Assembly, by the other principal organs of the United Nations and by the specialized agencies, namely, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Health Organization, from the first cease-fire decisions of 6 June 1967 until now is 54. These resolutions and decisions have, on the one hand, affirmed every Arab right and, on the other, confirmed Israel's utter disregard for those rights. Specifically, of these 54 resolutions, 14 "Condemn" or

"Strongly condemn" or "Specifically condemn" Israel for "flagrant violations" of the Charter of the United Nations, including attacks on the Arab countries, its refusal to apply the Fourth Geneva Convention and its violation of human rights. Nineteen of these 54 resolutions either "Deplore" or "Deeply deplore" or "Strongly deplore" or "Note with dismay" the refusal of Israel to co-operate in implementing specific resolutions or "Urgently call upon the Government of Israel" to implement the Charter and to respect the Charter.

230. Let me cite one very important resolution which was adopted by the Commission on Human Rights on 22 March 1972 and confirmed by the Economic and Social Council; paragraph 7 of Commission on Human Rights resolution 3 (XXVIII) reads:

"Considers that grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention committed by Israel in the occupied Arab territories constitute war crimes and an affront to humanity;"⁷

231. And Mr. Tekoah speaks about the lawlessness of Lebanon, when it is Israel which is taking up arms to apply its own law and its own rules to the Middle East. Mr. Tekoah speaks of resorting to such acts against Lebanon "as a last resort", in self-defence. He constantly repeats that to make us believe that Israel has resorted to other means—among others, perhaps, the United Nations. I should like to know, however: When did Mr. Tekoah come to the Security Council and present to it a complaint against Lebanon before Lebanon had presented an official, valid complaint against Israel?

232. If Israel really has serious grounds for accusing us of anything, and if it can substantiate a case and not fabricate a case, well, let them come to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council and say: "We are going to accuse Lebanon; this time Lebanon is going to be the defendant, and we, Israel, are going to be the plaintiff. We have had enough of Lebanon being the plaintiff; we want to change roles; we want to be the plaintiff this time and let Lebanon be the defendant." We are willing to accept that.

233. I challenge Mr. Tekoah, I challenge Israel, at any time to bring a serious case against Lebanon to this Council. We have had enough of this kind of accusation against our country and against our people and against decency and morality.

234. And they come and speak about the Security Council and why we receive justice here. Why do we receive resolutions in our favour? Because, they say, there is a double standard; because the composition of the Council is such as to favour Lebanon.

235. Well, I know of many delegations in this Council that are very friendly with the Israeli delegation, and I know that the Governments of many representatives at this table have diplomatic relations with Israel. Why is it that in this Council I hear the strong voice of the majority speak in defence of defenceless Lebanon? Why is it?

⁷ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 7, chap. XIII.*

236. To speak of a double standard is to accuse the Council and its members of duplicity with Lebanon. We have every trust in the justice, fairness and wisdom of the Council. I want only to give one example and cite what one of our colleagues around this table said a little while ago: "Is it the wish of Israel to go alone on the path of irresponsibility? International public opinion here, especially as represented and reflected at the United Nations, is growing every year more conscious, more appreciative, of the position of the Arab States, and more critical of the position of Israel."

237. We all recall the debates in the General Assembly, and I should like to know how many delegations represented there went to the rostrum of the General Assembly in defence of Israel. I can count scores of delegations that can see justice and right and upheld the Arab cause.

238. I have spoken more than necessary, but in conclusion I should like to refer to this question of the refugees in Lebanon, some of whom, at least, are being described as terrorists. In my letter to you, Mr. President, of 2 June 1972 [*S/10677/Rev.1*] I transmitted the text of a statement made by President Sleiman Franjieh of Lebanon in which he said the following, which I should like to appear in the record of this meeting:

"Lebanon, a country where toleration, liberty and humanity prevail, is not bound in any way whatsoever to assume responsibility for acts of violence whose recurrence and escalation it deplors.

"It is not Lebanon which can be held responsible for the presence in its territory, and the growing despair, of 300,000 Palestinian refugees, who are in Lebanon only because Israel, which drove them from their homes, refuses to allow them to return."

How could Lebanon be held responsible for actions committed outside of its territory? President Franjieh goes on to say:

"Lebanon condemns and rejects acts of violence. As in the past it condemned the barbarous acts committed by zionism at, for example, the King David Hotel, at Deir Yassin, at Bahr-el-Bakar and in Lebanon itself—an exhaustive list of such acts would be too large to prepare—it follows that Lebanon, faithful to its consistent position, should today condemn the attack against Lod airport during which a considerable number of innocent civilians were killed or wounded."

239. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon on that occasion stated to the press that Lebanon deplors the loss of the lives of innocent civilians, especially those not connected with the conflict in the Middle East. We understand the emotion of the representative of the United States when he spoke about the loss of life of 16 American Puerto Rican citizens. We have great sympathy for the American people and for the loss of those lives. My Government has conveyed its sympathy to the Government of the United States; but in doing so we refuse to allow anyone, from any quarter—and least of all from Israel—to point a finger at Lebanon in an attempt to connect it in one

way or another, in any form, with the Lod incident. I spoke about this yesterday, and I have amply refuted the allegations of the representative of Israel.

240. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

241. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): Fine words are not enough when the problem before us involves the lives of human beings. I have listened to, and before that I had read, the statement of President Franjieh. Even a gangster hideout can have on the front of it the sign of a flower shop, and this is precisely what is happening in Lebanon. Until and unless the Government of Lebanon decides that the time has come to take effective measures, as any civilized Government would and should, to put an end to terror attacks against Israel, the Government of Lebanon will remain responsible for international crimes and will be held responsible by my Government for the continuation of terror warfare against the territory of Israel and the people of Israel.

242. Worse than injuring an innocent person is mocking the injury inflicted. The Arab States have injured Israel by preventing Israel from receiving a fair hearing and from being able to have its problems considered on their merits in the United Nations. It is not our fault that there is one Israel, with one vote, and 18 Arab delegations, supported automatically, blindly and unreservedly, whatever the issue, by many others, irrespective of the justice of the cause. It is not Israel's fault that this is the situation and that, as a result of it, Israel cannot find in complaints to the United Nations a way to adjust its problems with its neighbours.

243. Yesterday I pointed out that it has been the inability of the United Nations throughout the years to deal equitably and effectively with Arab aggression pursued against Israel since 1948 that has been one of the most serious international failings. I stressed that for years Israel has called on the Security Council to take action to try to stop Arab armed attacks against Israel and its people, including complaints and requests to do so in relation to attacks from Lebanon. The Security Council has remained silent, whether because of the veto or because of its composition. It is not Israel's fault, but I think international public opinion should be aware of the fact that, of the 15 members present around this Council table, 7 have no diplomatic relations with Israel. Of 15 members, 7 have no diplomatic relations with Israel, and yet the representative of Lebanon comes here to mock at Israel, asking why it finds it difficult to rely on discussions before this body and why it cannot accept resolutions which reflect the political views of the majority of the members of the Security Council and in particular those which have no relations whatsoever with Israel and some of which even reject Israel's right to independence and sovereignty.

244. The Council has been unable for years to condemn even the murder in cold blood of innocent Israeli citizens, perpetrated in attacks from neighbouring Arab States. Is this proof that Israel's complaints, Israel's rights, have been rejected? The fact that Israeli prisoners of war, as I have pointed out, have languished for years in Syrian and

Egyptian captivity and that the Arab Governments have refused to agree to an exchange of prisoners with Israel has gone unnoticed. Is this cause to mock and to abuse?

245. There is a solution for this situation, and that is to stop believing that unbalanced resolutions reflecting simply the automatic weight of numbers on one side can have any effect whatever on the situation. There is a way, and that is to use this Council table, as some representatives have already suggested, for direct liaison, for contact, for exchange of views, for an effort to seek understanding and not to underline and highlight acrimony and difference. That is all we have been hearing for two days now. Has an attempt been made at these two meetings to bring about understanding between Israel and the Arab Governments? Has an attempt been made to say to the Arab Governments, "Sit down with the Israeli representatives and hear their views and consider them and try to find a solution"? Is this cause to hear again and again, "Israel does not come to this body and does not submit complaints"? We should have preferred that the situation were different, but we are not going to change the arithmetic of the family of nations. It in no way influences the justice of our cause.

246. What the representative of Lebanon said about the absence of resolutions condemning his country and the number of resolutions which addressed themselves to counteractions taken by us only confirms what I stated yesterday. I stressed that if one examines Security Council resolutions it appears as if Jewish blood and Jewish suffering and Jewish grief are of no concern to the Council. It is only when Israel as a last resort strikes back in self-defence to repel and avert attacks and protect the lives of its citizens that the Council seems to awaken to action.

247. I suggest that the representative of Lebanon and all of us juxtapose the resolutions arrived at because of the preponderance in number of the Arab delegations, as compared with the one Israeli delegation in the United Nations, that we juxtapose these one-sided, unfair, inequitable, ineffective resolutions with the tenets of international law, with the fundamental precepts and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is not political resolutions that will determine mankind's destiny but whether or not Members of the United Nations will abide by their obligations under the Charter and under the basic principles of international law. If those obligations emanating from the Charter and the basic precepts of international law are repudiated by the Arab Governments in relation to Israel, then there is no hope at all. There is no meaning in citing the numbers of resolutions expressing the imbalance of the parliamentary situation in any particular organ. It is unheard of that in the 20th century, when the greatest struggle has been going on for human rights, for the rights of small groups and minorities, internationally and internally, the fact that Israel is one small people confronting the onslaught, the enmity and the fanaticism of so many surrounding it should be said to make Israel's cause in any way less valid or less just. It is nothing new for the Jewish people to stand firm by itself. That has been our destiny throughout the ages. It has at no time affected the justice of our cause.

248. The representative of Lebanon referred again to the causation, the alleged nexus between the presence of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon and terror warfare which started 22 years after the refugees had arrived in Lebanon. If one does wish to enter into an examination of the historical facts, let me quote from a Lebanese newspaper, a Beirut weekly, *Kul-Shai*, which said as far back as August 1951, only three years after the invasion of Israel by its Arab neighbours:

"Who brought the Palestinians to Lebanon as refugees suffering now from the malign attitude of newspapers and communal leaders? We have neither honour nor conscience. Who brought them over in dire straits and penniless after they lost their honour? The Arab States, and Lebanon amongst them, did it."

249. There are enough facts, there are enough documents to prove who called on the Palestinian refugees to leave their homes so as to be able to return with the invading, victorious Arab armies on the ruins of the Jewish people of Israel.

250. The representative of Lebanon wishes us to attach credibility to his statements. It is difficult to do that, not only in the light of what was said by him yesterday and again today, but also in the light of the lengthy experience of years and years of exchanges of views and discussions in this organ. It was on 30 December 1968 that the representative of Lebanon denied, as he did today, the presence of terrorist organizations on Lebanese soil; he stated: "Lebanon shelters no commando organization" [1461st meeting, para. 161]. It was only a few months later that the President of Lebanon at the time, Mr. Hélou, stated, as quoted in the Beirut daily *Al-Hayat* on 1 July 1969:

"President Hélou said, *inter alia*, on 3 November 1968 that the number of saboteurs in Lebanon did not exceed a few hundred and we were then dealing with their problem. But suddenly they began issuing propaganda publications against us and their numbers rose to over several thousands."

The President added:

"Lebanon had stressed in the Security Council that there were no saboteur bases on its territory in order to obtain a condemnation of Israel by the Council."

251. There is nothing new in the manoeuvres of the representative of Lebanon. It is difficult to assume that he is more faithful to facts now than in previous debates.

252. The representative of Somalia found it advisable to make a second statement in the Security Council and to prove once again what is the fundamental difficulty that we face here: the selectivity, the lack of equity which we confront. The representative of Somalia quoted from a declaration, from a resolution which I think all members present at this table supported, a declaration which was adopted unanimously. But he misquoted by stopping in the middle of a sentence and not continuing to read out of that

declaration. The very paragraph from which he quoted says also—and this is a declaration adopted only two years ago by the General Assembly—that “every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State” [General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)].

253. There is only one law for all of us, for all Members of the United Nations, and if we are to try at least to improve the international situation, whether it is in the Middle East or in any other part of the world, let us be more serious than we have been in applying equally to all Member States in accordance with the basic provisions of the Charter the same rules of law, the same provisions, not misinterpreting, not misquoting and not taking out of context.

254. The representative of Egypt spoke here about destruction and about suffering in Israeli-held territories, in territories administered by Israel since 1967. The representative of Egypt has not been in the land of Israel, in Palestine, for a long time. He may remember—he undoubtedly does—the 19 years of oppression, of military rule, of persecution to which the inhabitants of Gaza were subjected by the Egyptian military authorities. He undoubtedly remembers how other Arab Governments compared the measures of repression taken by the Egyptian military administration against the inhabitants of Gaza to Nazi methods applied in the Second World War. I would suggest that the representative of Egypt visit the West Bank and Gaza today and see for himself. If he does not feel that progress, development and material improvement are of any significance, if he does not consider the fact that on the West Bank agricultural production has increased fourfold in the last five years, that for the first time industry is being developed, that in Gaza for the first time industries are being established, that agriculture has increased fivefold, that the average earnings both in the Gaza area and in the West Bank have risen tremendously in comparison with the situation that existed in 1967—if this to him has no significance, let him join the 150,000 visitors from neighbouring Arab States who are visiting Gaza and the West Bank during the summer months. Let him mingle amongst them and amongst the Israelis. Let him see what coexistence is, what co-operation between Jew and Arab can be in the Middle East. Let him also see what freedom of expression is. Let him read the papers which are being published by his Arab brethren and by our Arab cousins and let him find another Arab State, or more than one, in which the press enjoys the same freedom of expression. Let him take into consideration the elections which were held only recently on the West Bank in which new young Arab leaders come to the fore. Let him ask the people, almost a million Arab inhabitants of Israeli-held territories, what their feelings are about future relations with Israel. Are they thinking, as some of the Arab representatives have been and are, in terms of continued enmity, hostility and war, or do they find that the conditions prevailing in those areas today are the first beginnings of peace, in certain parts already almost *de facto* peace?

255. As for Egypt's attitude, President Anwar Sadat has made it clear recently in statement after statement that Israel's withdrawal to the pre-1967 lines would be only a prelude to the total destruction of the State and people of

Israel. As recently as 17 February 1972, the President stated, “Israel is a foreign limb which has been forced onto the body of the Arab nation, and that body rejects it.” President Sadat's close confidant-collaborator *Al Ahram's* editor Hassanein Heykal stated, explaining Egyptian policy, “There are only two specific Arab goals at this stage: first, the elimination of the consequences of the 1967 aggression through Israel's withdrawal from all the lands it occupied that year; and, secondly, the elimination of the consequences of the 1948 aggression through the eradication of Israel”. Now is the representative of Egypt ready to deny, to repudiate, these statements? If he is—if his leaders are ready to abandon their policy of continuous aggression and intransigence—we may, in fact, be taking the first step towards understanding and agreement.

256. Finally, Mr. President, I regret to have to refer to a statement made by you in your capacity as representative of Yugoslavia. That statement has, I am afraid I must say, demonstrated in the starkest of terms the very reason for the disabilities the Security Council confronts in trying to deal with the Middle East situation in a fair and equitable manner. Not even the fact that the representative of Yugoslavia serves as President of the Security Council has deterred him from making a one-sided, abusive statement full of distortions and misrepresentations. I think it is sufficient to read it to arrive at that conclusion. I shall make only one observation. The representative of Yugoslavia spoke about Israel's growing isolation. Strangely, he echoed an identical remark which we heard yesterday from another representative on the Security Council. I should like to assure him that there is no isolation when one struggles for one's rights, and there is no isolation when one struggles to preserve one's freedom and independence. There is no isolation when one knows that the cause of the people of Israel is righteous, and there is no isolation when history and justice are on one's side.

257. Our opponents, as I have already pointed out, have always been more numerous than we, the Jewish people, and the Jewish people has always been a small people. It has always been a minority in an ocean of foes. And yet we have survived and restored our rights, and we know that we shall succeed in preserving those rights.

258. If the Yugoslav Government is really interested in peace in the Mediterranean, there is only one way to contribute to it, and that is to stop its one-sided policy of identification with and support for Arab extremism and aggression and to adopt a fair, equitable, balanced, constructive attitude. As long as the Yugoslav Government continues on its present course, its counsels are of little interest to those who earnestly desire peace.

259. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

260. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Many points have been raised by the representative of Israel which for truth's sake should not be left unchallenged and unanswered.

261. A very important point to which he has referred time and again is that the composition of the Security Council or the General Assembly is such that the Arabs can always obtain the number of votes they want on any resolution. Let us be a little specific on this point. I shall not speak in generalities; I shall speak specifically.

262. I take Security Council resolution 237 (1967), adopted on 14 June 1967, which calls upon Israel to facilitate the return of the new refugees and to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the occupied areas. Now, this resolution was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, as the record will show, with no dissenting vote whatsoever. It was then affirmed by General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967, which obtained 116 votes. Again, Security Council resolution 237 (1967) was affirmed by Council resolution 259 (1968) of 27 September 1968.

263. Now, either Mr. Tekoah has to accept, in accordance with his own logic, that the number of votes is a deciding factor or he does not. If he does, then those resolutions, which were adopted unanimously by the Security Council, and by more than 100 votes in the General Assembly, are undeniable. They contain the reply to Mr. Tekoah himself. If it is the number of votes he is invoking, what about those resolutions and decisions of the Security Council adopted unanimously—including the votes of the United States, the great supporter of Israel?

264. Now, resolution 237 (1967) stipulated, among other things, that a representative of the Secretary-General should go and investigate the occupied areas. But Israel has refused. It is a long story; it is summarized in the report of the Secretary-General of 31 July 1968 concerning the interpretation of resolution 237 (1967) adopted unanimously by the Security Council. The Secretary-General said:

"Under a strictly legal interpretation of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967 and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 it is clear that they do not apply to minorities in the territories of . . . those States most directly concerned. Operative paragraph 1 of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) calls upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place. This paragraph applies without question to the area occupied by Israel since June 1967." [See S/8699, para. 10.]

And since then Israel has refused and still refuses to allow a representative of the Secretary-General to go and investigate those areas.

265. Mr. Tekoah spoke about the progress that has taken place in the occupied territories. To put it in a nutshell, what Mr. Tekoah is telling us is that Israel waged the 1967 war in order to raise the standard of living of the Arabs in the surrounding areas, in order to improve their schools, their hospitals and their education and, in a word, in order to improve the situation of the Arabs. Now that is really too flippant an argument to be taken seriously and to be answered. That is the classical, traditional "white man's

burden" justification of colonialism and I am really glad that we heard it from Mr. Tekoah, because now in 1972 we are hearing someone speaking not in the nineteenth century but here in the Security Council, after the Charter, about the white man's burden.

266. All we are supposed to do is to thank Mr. Tekoah for that great effort in emptying the Golan heights and in doing whatever they have done.

267. He said that there was one law for us—to be serious about the Charter. If we take into consideration the map that I presented to the Council today and the resolutions adopted by the twenty-eighth Zionist Congress, that means that all Arab territories should be annexed to and administered by Israel.

268. The analogy drawn by Mr. Tekoah of the flower shop hiding bombs is also something that was apparently invented by Israel in the Middle East. I wish to remind him of the following, which is to be found in the *Haganah*, under the title "The Turn of Oriental Jewry". The author states that as early as 1941 he himself was charged with the task of infiltration to convince Jews in Arab countries, Turkey and Iran, to migrate to future Israel. A route was established from Iran to Iraq, and thence by way of Transjordan, or Syria and Lebanon, into Palestine. To facilitate this infiltration, Jewish families were prevailed upon to provide way stations, sometimes in the form of an "import-export agency", as was the case in Damascus, Beirut and Baghdad.

269. So the flower shop hiding bombs was really something introduced by the Haganah in such places as the capital of my colleague from Lebanon, my own capital and Baghdad.

270. As to freedom of the press, a very revealing article was published in the *Village Voice* of 3 February 1972 by an Israel intellectual, Uri Davis. It is a very long article, but I shall be satisfied to show the situation of the Arabs in Israel by quoting the following. He said:

"I travelled much. Visited the homes of my Arab fellow students. Experienced at first hand their impossible situation: citizens in a political structure which by definition and necessarily excludes them from equal participation and denies them equal rights."

That is an altogether different picture from the one given by Mr. Tekoah.

271. Finally—and to make a long story short—the following is a very revealing fact of the situation from no less a man than Mr. Dayan, addressing the students of the Technion in Haifa on 19 March 1969, as reported in *Ha'aretz*, on 4 April 1969. He said:

"There is not a single Jewish village in this country that has not been built on the site of an Arab village. The village of Nahalal took the place of the Arab village of Mahloul . . . Gifat took the place of Jifta, etc."

272. That is the kind of justice and law that the lawgiver, Mr. Tekoah, wants to give to the Council. What his Minister of Defence said is the best commentary on his own statement.

273. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Jordan to take a seat at the Council table and to exercise his right of reply.

274. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): I hesitate to speak again at this late hour and at this decisive moment. However, I feel prompted to do so by a statement that was made; I feel that I must, on behalf of my Government, set the record straight with respect to it. I shall do so very clearly in the context of the present subject of discussion, namely, the complaint of Lebanon, which requires urgent and decisive action, not delay and procrastination or any elaborate statements on the part of my delegation or, if I may say so, on the part of other delegations, on matters that do not pertain specifically to the issue.

275. The representative of Israel in exercising his right of reply referred to the situation in the West Bank of Jordan under occupation. The question of the West Bank under occupation does not arise in the present discussion. The question is that of Lebanon and the series of Israeli military operations against Lebanese territory, civilians and military targets. However, as long as the Israeli representative has referred to the situation in the West Bank and to what he has tried to depict as achievement, progress and prosperity in the occupied territories in contrast with what seems to be either backwardness or lack of progress in the period of natural unity and union and normalcy prior to the present occupation, I feel I must try to correct some of that impression. That agriculture thrives or that farmers work hard at present and obtain better production is not the issue, nor is it a justification for occupation. That industry is just being introduced is, to say the least, a totally unfounded statement. The West Bank of Jordan has had a thriving and prosperous economy; particularly in the 10 or 15 years before the occupation it enjoyed a phenomenal change in development and progress.

276. This has been witnessed and has been recognized by impartial observers from various countries of the world who have visited the West Bank and Arab Jerusalem—which is part and parcel of it—during that period. However, whether economic change has come about by artificial methods or whether it has come about under the present occupation through the injection of artificial methods, of artificial and temporary and contrived economic prosperity, this is by no means a justification or a rationale for the continued occupation. The same argument has been invoked repeatedly, for decades, by colonial Powers in justification of their continued occupation.

277. The issue remains that nations do not, when they resist occupation, when they yearn for their independence, discuss standards of living and indexes for economic development and prosperity—although I wish to question even that economic prosperity and its continuity under the present Israeli occupation. The question before the United Nations is the need for the termination of the present Israeli occupation in the occupied territories.

278. As far as the municipal elections are concerned, I wish also to state that selective and contrived municipal elections were conducted under occupation, that their validity can obviously be disputed and questioned by every member in this Council and in the United Nations. Such politically manipulated, selective elections obviously cannot be accepted as valid or as representative in any way of a democratic expression of freedom of choice, and this will continue as long as armed forces of an occupying Power are present.

279. But the question to be settled is quite different. We can argue continuously over the representativeness or lack of representativeness of these elections. Obviously, while I reserve fully our position of questioning the validity of these elections, the test of their validity or their representativeness, or their effectiveness is obviously the concrete step of allowing these people, the Arab people in the occupied territories, the Jordanian people in the occupied territories, the Palestinians in the occupied territories, in the absence of elections, to exercise their freedom of choice and expression of free will on the political issues before them, and not on municipal or other similar local concerns that pertain to the organization of their daily lives and their daily and municipal needs.

280. The question of freedom of expression can have validity only when the forces of Israel which at present occupy substantial parts of the Arab territories, substantial parts of Jordan, substantial parts of Egypt and of Syria—and now there is an encroachment into Lebanon—end their occupation in accordance with repeated United Nations resolutions. Only when the situation is returned to normal within the context of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and a just peace prevails can a correct, representative and effective expression of free will have meaning for the United Nations, for Jordan, for the area.

281. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

282. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): I should like to make a brief observation. I have listened with great care, as I always do, to the statement of the representative of Jordan. He has again used the argument, which we have heard repeatedly in various organs of the United Nations, that Israel invokes the improvement of the situation in Israeli-held territories, whether the West Bank or the Gaza area, as justification of the Israeli presence in those areas.

283. I would simply like to say that that is not the reason why we again and again draw attention to the fact that not only is life in those areas satisfactory today, but that there has been progress and improvement as compared to the pre-1967 situation. The reason for our drawing attention to this development and to this progress, to the normalcy of life, is to rebut the absurd accusations which are being heard here and elsewhere from Arab representatives that Israel is guilty of actions which are comparable, for instance, to war crimes. Now, is it not absurd that, on the one hand, we hear from the representative of Jordan confirmation that there has been development, that there has been progress, and we attach no political significance to

it, and that, on the other hand, the Arab delegations try to push through certain organs of the United Nations resolutions accusing Israel of war crimes? It is therefore simply a question of fact, of what the reality is, what the truth is. And the fact that the Arab delegations do succeed, in certain organs of the United Nations, in getting resolutions of this kind adopted, including these fantastic, absurd charges against Israel, is simply additional proof of the parliamentary imbalance and of the fact that Israel's case does not, and unfortunately cannot, get an equitable hearing in the organs of the United Nations.

284. The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers for this evening. The hour is late and the Council is still expecting proposals or draft resolutions to be submitted. The representative of the United States, in his statement, announced that his delegation probably will submit a draft resolution at the appropriate time. I am also informed that other members of the Security Council are completing their consultations towards the submission of a draft resolution. Once the draft resolution or resolutions are submitted, time

will still be needed, for technical reasons, for their translation and distribution.

285. The hour is late, but the situation which is under consideration here is really very grave, and during our deliberations general concern about this has been expressed. That is why it is felt that action by the Council is urgent and that we should proceed without delay.

286. Bearing all that in mind, I intend now to propose the adjournment of the meeting. I had also intended to convene the next meeting within a short time, possibly this evening, but I am now advised that the consultations among certain members of the Council towards the submission of a draft resolution are still in progress and that additional time is needed. To provide sufficient time for these consultations, I therefore propose that the next meeting be held on Monday morning at 11 o'clock. As there is no objection, I shall take it that it is so decided.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женеве.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
